want to regard you as that type of man. At any rate, it makes me sure Charley Michelson didn't write the letter for you. He would have done a better job.

Very sincerely,

FRANK R. KENT.

JOHN J. RASKOB,
Chairman Democratic National Committee,
Washington, D. C.

P. S.—One thing—and only one thing—in my article I want to retract. That is the statement that Mr. Hunt is Mr. Shouse's brother-in-law. I was incorrectly informed and apologize to them both.

RECESS

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, January 16, 1931, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 15 (legislative day of January 5), 1931

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Frank Martinez, of New York, to be United States attorney, district of Porto Rico, to succeed John L. Gay, resigned.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY

MEDICAL CORPS

To be first lieutenants

First Lieut. Harold Hanson Twitchell, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from January 9, 1931.

First Lieut. Kenneth George Gould, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from January 9, 1931.

First Lieut. Richard Love Daniel, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from January 9, 1931.

First Lieut. Thomas James Hartford, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from January 9, 1931.

First Lieut. Paul Herbert Martin, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from January 9, 1931.

First Lieut. Saunders Murray, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from January 9, 1931.

First Lieut. William Henry Christian, jr., Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from January 9, 1931.

First Lieut. Otto Leonard Churney, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from January 9, 1931.

First Lieut. Henry Clay Chenault, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from January 9, 1931.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE ARMY

TO FIELD ARTILLERY

Lieut. Col. Sherman Miles, Coast Artillery Corps (detailed in General Staff Corps), with rank from August 24, 1929.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY

To be colonels

Lieut. Col. Richard Wilde Walker, Cavalry, from January 9, 1931.

Lieut. Col. Carl Carlton Jones, Quartermaster Corps, from January 14, 1931.

To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. William Ducachet Geary, Field Artillery, from January 9, 1931.

Maj. Emil Pehr Pierson, Cavalry, from January 14, 1931, subject to examination required by law.

To be majors

Capt. Robert Graham Forsythe, Signal Corps, from January 9, 1931.

Capt. Orsen Everett Paxton, Infantry, from January 14, 1931.

To be captains

First Lieut. George Washington Polk, jr., Air Corps, from January 9, 1931.

First Lieut. Francis Herron Jack, jr., Infantry, from January 9, 1931.

First Lieut. Devereux Maitland Myers, Air Corps, from January 11, 1931.

First Lieut. Alfred Warrington Marriner, Air Corps, from January 14, 1931.

First Lieut. Guy Harrison Gale, Air Corps, from January 14, 1931.

To be first lieutenants

Second Lieut. Meredith Cornwell Noble, Infantry, from January 9, 1931.

Second Lieut. George Henry McManus, jr., Field Artillery, from January 9, 1931.

Second Lieut. Leo Francis Kengla, jr., Infantry, from January 11, 1931.

Second Lieut. Robert Emmett Burns, Signal Corps, from January 12, 1931.

Second Lieut. John Amos Hall, Infantry, from January 14, 1931.

Second Lieut. Donald Janser Bailey, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 14, 1931, subject to examination required by law.

DENTAL CORPS

To be major

Capt. Clarence Constantin Olson, Dental Corps, from January 10, 1931.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 15, 1931

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Merciful God, we thank Thee that to-day offers another opportunity for service. It is more—we would have it a new life-confessing dependence upon divine grace and entering upon an avowed devotion to our country's welfare. In public and in private life may we be strong, noble-minded, sweet-tempered, and loving-hearted, always with fresh delight in our labors. If lulled into carelessness, arouse us to manly vigor; and if we cherish any bitterness, permit us not to be overpowered by it. Above all achievements is the wonder of wonders and the marvelous possibility open to us, namely, in spirit and in deed we can reflect the example of the great Teacher. Our Father, parallel our pathway, and Thine shall be the glory. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 447) entitled "Joint resolution making an appropriation to carry out the provisions of the public resolution entitled 'Joint resolution for the relief of farmers in the drought and/or storm stricken areas of the United States,' approved December 20, 1930," and had receded from its amendments numbered 1 and 2 to said joint resolution.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. REED and Mr. FLETCHER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the War Department.

THE CHRISTIE TANK

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the famous Christie tank is at the east door of the Capitol and will be there until about 2.30 this afternoon for the

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

inspection of Members of the Congress. This is, perhaps, the most modern and important fighting implement that has been invented since the war, and I personally—and I know I speak for the other members of the subcommittee—would like for every Member of the House to see it.

POST OFFICE AND TREASURY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 14246) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, further insist upon disagreement to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

Mr STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand there are one or two items that the conferees have refused to approve in conference.

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the scope of those provisions?

Mr. WOOD. There are several controversial items. One is with reference to an appropriation for an air line from the United States to Mexico City; another an appropriation of $750,000 for an air line from St. Paul to Seattle; and another is the salary increases.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman does not mean to say that the Senate is insisting on additional appropriations for the air mail service in addition to the amounts incorporated in the bill?

Mr. WOOD. That is what they are doing.

Mr. STAFFORD. The appropriation for the line to Mexico City is in addition to the $7,000,000 which we appropriated, although it was shown that the receipts from air mail for foreign service is only $332,000. We are appropriating $7,000,000 as a pure subsidy for the carriage of mail from foreign ports like Cristobal to Pernambuco.

Mr. WOOD. We are further insisting on disagreement to that provision.

Mr. STAFFORD. I hope the House conferees will continue to insist until next December.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WOOD, THATCHER, HARDY, WELSH of Pennsylvania, BYRNS, and ARNOLD.

AMERICA'S INTEREST IN THE BANK FOR INTERNATIONAL SETTLEMENTS

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an address delivered by myself at Providence, R. I., night before last.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me Tuesday evening, January 13, 1931, before the Economic Club, of Providence, R. I.:

For nearly a year now the Bank for International Settlements, which in its conception was to have a corporate being free from political control by any sovereign power, has been able to enjoy corporate existence and enter upon its unique functions because the sovereign state of Switzerland generously consented to become its creator.

It was created in this normal and prosaic way because, however, portentous its advent upon the human scene may be, miraculous birth did not seem feasible for it to the members of the Young Committee in 1929. Switzerland was selected as its parent because the thought of its birth and growth from youth to maturity taking place at London aroused such ineradicable apprehensions at Paris, and the thought of such growth taking place at Paris aroused such precisely similar apprehensions at London, that some sovereign power which was not suspect had to be chosen.

Every bank exists by virtue of the physical protection which the state which creates it gives to it. Policemen or gendarme patrol its approaches, and if need be the military forces of the state intervene to guard its treasures against the depredations of marauders. The reciprocal obligation follows of loyalty and obedience on the part of the bank to the will of its sovereign creator and to it alone.

The Swiss are a redoubtable people. Surrounded through the centuries by warlike and aggressive powers, they have expelled every incursion of the foreigner into their mountain fastnesses and maintained their independence unimpaired. They would be quick to oppose any aggression from without.

Swiss honor also is unimpeachable, and the bank's directors may therefore rest easy as to the safety of the funds within its vaults, even though those funds would necessarily be at the disposal of the Swiss state.

Should an aggressive European power, or a coalition of powers, threaten a raid upon those vaults, the entire military force of Switzerland may be depended upon to die to the last man in its defense as they did at Morgarten or St. Jaques.

This is a heavy responsibility for the world to ask the state of Switzerland to accept. But the responsibility may be greatly lightened if the bulk of the gold stocks of the bank may, by arrangement, be left on deposit in Paris or London, so that, for the most part, gold transfers may be effected by mere book entries as is the custom of the central bank of a sovereign state in making transfers of gold between private domestic banks. In such case the total amount of the treasure in the vaults of the bank at Basel might be very small, and it would not be necessary for the promising Swiss youth to pour out its blood upon the steps of the bank.

In such case, also, the strength of the bank will rest upon moral prestige and not upon the support of physical force except such as in an exceptional case the League of Nations might marshal for its protection. So highly does our Federal reserve system esteem the moral prestige of the bank that it has already parted with some of its high officials in order that they may become officers of the Bank for International Settlements and contribute their talents to the bank's success.

It is said that the Federal reserve system puts such great confidence in it that it may entrust a large part of its gold to the custody of the bank, thus obviating the frequent shipment of bullion across the Atlantic in either direction and greatly facilitating international transfer of funds.

As to the safety of the gold, besides the redoubtable guardianship of the Swiss Government, the League of Nations could, at need, marshal the collective military force of Europe against any aggressor who, in defiance of a decision of the World Court, might seek to seize it by force. Thus, whatever stocks of gold we entrusted to the Bank for International Settlements would be under the protection of the council of the League of Nations.

In case our Federal reserve bank requested a gold credit, or shipment of gold which we had on deposit in the Bank for International Settlements, and this became a matter of dispute, and the latter bank felt that it must refuse to make the transfer, the American interests could file suit in the World Court, and the Council of the League of Nations could be depended on to put any decision of that court into execution.

While it is a legal truism that possession is nine points of the law, and while possession of the disputed gold in such a case would be held in Europe, the moral and judicial majesty of the World Court will be such that it would be unthinkable for the American litigants to question the decision.

Thus, these beneficent institutions of an enlightened age insure the settlement of all financial differences between the United States and the states of Europe by peaceful means.

I do not desire to make an address here, gentlemen, in an ironical vein. My position in regard to the Bank for International Settlements is known. America should have no more interest in this bank than it has in the Bank of England, the Bank of France, the Reichsbank, or the Bank of Turkey. The function of the Federal reserve system is to protect the gold and regulate the currency of the United States, and its foreign contacts should be only incidental to this purpose. Political motives, such as financial aid in establishing or strengthening any political power in Europe, or financial pressure to compel action by some other political organism in Europe, ought not to be within the authority of the Federal reserve system.

I have spoken frequently during the past year, in Congress and elsewhere, upon the tendency of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York to blaze an independent trail by establishing and developing extensive contacts abroad for which it has no authorization in law, and of the deleterious effects of its policies upon our domestic conditions. I have covered the ground quite fully and in that connection have warned against its efforts to involve us in the world bank created by the Young plan.

The banking system of a state is such as the state chooses to set up. To coin money and regulate its value is an attribute of sovereign power, and in the exercise of this power the state establishes its banking system. If the state abandons control of its banking system to others it quickly ceases to be sovereign, for those who control the nation's wealth control the nation. Within the banking system of a sovereign state mutual aid and credit extensions among banks may be carried to great lengths for these funds all remain under the control of the state. This is not true as to foreign banks, and the extension of credits to a foreign state or bank ought not to be exercised at the independent will of the banking system. They ought to be matters for decision by sovereign authority.

We established the Federal reserve system a few months before the war broke out in Europe, and thereby created a centralized control of currency and the use of credit. Each of the 12 Federal reserve banks was to regulate credit in its district according to the needs there, and the activities of the reserve banks were to be coordinated under the supervision of the Federal Reserve Board at Washington.

The banks were given the power to buy and sell gold abroad, but it was the intention of the makers of the Federal reserve

act that this power should be merely incidental to the primary purpose of affording proper credit facilities to American citizens. The Federal reserve act did not contemplate the needs of the foreigner; it contemplated the needs of the American people solely.

But no sooner was the act passed and the Federal reserve system set in operation than the war in Europe broke out and exerted a profound influence upon our financial structure. The Federal reserve system became the vehicle for the transfer of vast funds from Europe to America, and especially after we entered the war for the transfer of vast sums of American wealth to Europe. These transfers were nearly all made through the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. This expansion of the purposes of the Federal reserve system was made by the authority of the Government in Washington and was necessitated by the exigencies of war.

After we entered the war the successive Liberty and Victory loans raised the necessary billions through subscription by the people. The billions destined for Europe were, as it were, drawn into a vast funnel whose mouth was the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and from there poured across the Atlantic. This raised the international bankers of New York who were representing foreign governments to a dizzy eminence of financial power and created the most intimate contacts between the agents of the respective financial powers in New York, London, and Paris. The sense of unity with our associated nations in the war found its highest expression in the trans-Atlantic contacts established by these New York bankers. A roomy financial conduit had been constructed across the Atlantic through which the entire liquid wealth of either hemisphere might easily be transferred to the other, provided those who controlled the wealth so desired.

That roomy financial conduit still exists as it was created in war time. After performing its war functions it served again from 1921 to 1924 for the great flow of gold metal westward when Europe made a belated settlement of its vast unpaid trade balance.

When that service was completed the function of this trans-Atlantic financial conduit, this feat of financial engineering, should have come to an end. Having served its war purpose, it should have been dismantled. It is too roomy for peace purposes. Its potentialities are as great as would be those of a tunnel from the United States to Europe built of stone and mortar. A reconsideration of the Federal reserve act ought to have been undertaken in 1925 and legislation effected to curb the powers of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. As it was not done then, it is urgently needed now. Only a subordinate governmental agency in its nature, the Federal reserve system, dominated by a group of New York international bankers, is now claiming the right to exercise its powers independent of governmental control. It resents the suggestion of action by the Congress to regulate its functions and it aspires to assert equality with, or superiority over, the sovereign Government of the United States.

Suppose the Congress of the United States yields to these claims. History, particularly recent history, shows that the great financiers are able to insinuate their agents into high place with each incoming administration and to control both the State and Treasury Departments. They dominate the policies of the executive branch. If the Congress through the influence of the financial power over it becomes unable to regulate the banking system of the country and thus to curb an autocratic financial power, the political Government at Washington will cease to be a sovereign power and will become but the agent of an irresponsible and world-wide financial autocracy.

And to what uses would the roomy, war-time financial conduit across the Atlantic be put? Those superfinanciers who assume to tell us what is best for us, citizens of the United States as they are, are already saying that a redistribution of the great gold stock of the United States is urgently needed. Assume that, fascinated by these masterful voices, the citizenship of this country interposes no obstacle and permits them to have their way. Before any belated voices might rise in alarmed protest, the deed would be done, and the Eastern Hemisphere would again be dominant through the power of gold. The great savings-bank deposits of the American people would shrink, credit, no longer a common utility, would become the rich man's privilege, money would be scarce and poverty common; or if the effort were made to furnish more currency than the attenuated gold base warranted, there would be the eternal vexation of monetary troubles.

Economics is not one thing and politics another. If this great change were brought about by the financiers, it would be the most supendous political coup that the world ever saw. Nearly all the currency of this country is now in the possession of the great New York banks. Banks elsewhere and the people hold depreciated securities and can not find the funds needed for legitimate business. This currency ought to go back to the banks of the country and to the people in order that the great internal trade of the country may be stimulated and the great domestic market resume its activity. Gathered into the vaults of New York, this collective liquid wealth of the American people lies entirely too conveniently near to the western mouth of the roomy, war-time financial conduit to Europe.

We know what the money loaned to Europe in the war went for. It went to pay for things which were being consumed in the holocaust of war. Steadily the long-accumulated wealth flowed out of Europe to pay for what the war was continuously burning up. First, they spent their ready cash; then they sold their vast holdings abroad to secure new credits; then, after we entered the war, they borrowed $11,000,000,000 from us.

No bullion shipments were made on account of trade balance after we entered the war, and it was because Europe was very slow to make these shipments after the war ended that we suffered the credit stringency which produced our hard times of 1920 and 1921. It was only after the allied states were forced to settle their trade balance in gold that the credit base of our financial structure was broadened by the acquisition of an adequate gold stock that restored our banking system to a normal condition. It was only after the exportation of this gold from Europe took place also that the poverty to which the war had reduced all the states of Europe became apparent. It was not until then that realization came in the United States that Europe was impoverished and that the United States had become by far the wealthiest country in the world.

Why should responsible authority seek, as it has done for years, to conceal from public knowledge the simple explanation of the great accumulation of our postwar wealth? That accumulation of wealth is due essentially to the fact that from 1921 to 1924 there was a steady flow of gold coming into our ports chiefly from Europe or on European account, reaching by the end of the third year the figure of more than $2,000,000,000. This bullion became gold reserves in the banks and furnished an amount of good currency adequate to the needs of the vigorous industrial population of our continent. Yet a few years ago a great commission of economists appointed by political authority to determine the causes of our postwar prosperity wholly ignored this single definite cause and ascribed it vaguely to "acceleration, spread, and tempo."

Why should they not have been honest and courageous about it? If the public understood the specific cause for our postwar wealth, and realizing the magnitude of that wealth, would it not have a better understanding of the question of debts and reparations?

How could such a stupendous paroxysm of warfare, lasting for nearly five years and exhausting every resource of the entire continent of Europe, have failed to bring a profound change in the world? Its economic consequences were manifested with singular clearness by those steady shipments westward across the Atlantic from 1912 to 1924 of more than 4,000 tons of gold metal. Vast as have been these shipments of gold, they still leave Europe in our debt; she still owes us the $11,000,000,000 of public debts which we loaned her in the war, and in addition approximately four billions in private debts contracted since the war ended. Why do not our economists, public and private, acknowledge that it is the acquisition of our great postwar gold stock that explains the economic power of the American Republic to-day and that, if we relinquished possession of our gold, our economic power would wane. Whence came the "acceleration, spread, and tempo" which the committee on economic changes found to be the cause of American prosperity?

The war in Europe must be viewed from one of two opposed standpoints, and in accordance with the view from one of these standpoints the great financial and economic decisions of to-day must be made, fixing the course of history for centuries to come.

In the first view, the war in Europe brought an era of history to a close. It transferred the center of civilization's power from the Eastern Hemisphere to the Western. It made a new and different conception of cultural life predominant in the world.

In the second view, the war in Europe changed nothing permanently. It brought greater temporary exhaustion to Europe than any previous war had done, but recuperation will take place with increasing rapidity and Europe will regain its former relative position in the world.

If the view from the first standpoint prevails, the United States will retain and protect its gold stock and utilizing its resulting economic power in the way it judges best, and Europe will acquiesce in this decision.

If the second view prevails, the American people will regard their possession of $4,000,000,000 in gold as incidental and transitory and acquiesce more or less actively in its redistribution among those who held it before the war. They will suffer the consequent lowering of their economic power with equanimity. Europe will quickly regain possession of it, and with it of the economic and political vigor which characterized that continent before the war.

The struggle goes on between the two sides. Its evidences have been plainly visible during the past decade.

I do not see how any administration in Washington could fail to adopt the first view unequivocally. I do not see how any administration could justify itself for adopting the second. Under any circumstances, it would have no right to adopt and act upon the second view until the question had been made a political issue and the will of the people had been expressed. In a democratic republic, great and vital questions of foreign policy are not to be considered and decided in secret by a handful of men in temporary office in Washington. The people of the Republic have the right to determine their own destiny.

The peoples and governments of Europe are impoverished. They wish and insist that we should pool our wealth with them in order that the pre-war balance may be reestablished. It is too much to ask of us, and the issue should be squarely met. It should be made clear once and for all that the gold stock of the United States is to remain here permanently to water the garden of American industrial life. And it should be made clear also that it is in this way that the United States can make its greatest contribution to the world's civilization.

It is because the statesmen of Europe have for 12 years rejected this reality and have tortured their brains with schemes for effect-

ing the quick return to Europe of its lost gold that no progress in reconstruction has been made. I have recently analyzed the Stresemann policy, which for years all Europe has been pressing and have shown how under it Europe was to be made over again in a few years' time through the acquisition of billions of dollars realized by the sale in the United States of German reparation bonds, and I have shown the more than dubious moral and legal quality of those bonds.

That such a scheme could have been openly pressed by our own leading financiers, and surreptitiously aided by successive administrations in Washington, as it has been, until it has actually reached dangerous proportions for us, is sufficient evidence that it is time for the Congress and public opinion to interest themselves in establishing proper control over our foreign relations.

The surreptitious support of this policy by the State and Treasury Departments has continued for years. When the peace conference convened in Paris after the war, the American delegation was accompanied by a hundred eminent scholars with a library of 10,000 books. Attachés of the American delegation sprang, as it were, from the ground to accord their valuable aid in one or another phase of the work to be done. But the men who emerged from this intellectual welter to sit in the inner councils of the conference and guide the steps of the American delegation were a selected group of the international bankers of New York.

Hand and glove they worked with the internationalists of Europe. The Europeans molded the treaty to suit themselves, and the American financiers persuaded the American delegation to sign it.

The treaty provided for reparations afterwards fixed at $33,000,000,000, and Annex II to the reparation clauses provided that this sum might be capitalized by the Allied Governments and sold as bonds to purchasers on the world's investment markets. If the bonds could be successfully marketed, France would receive about $16,000,000,000 in cash, Britain six or seven billions, and the smaller allies lesser sums.

The purpose of this provision, as subsequent events have proved, was to sell the bonds in the United States chiefly, which would thus pay the German indemnity to the Allies in cash, and look to Germany for reimbursement. If the scheme could have been executed in its pristine brightness, Europe would have been over the effects of the war in 10 years time, and the United States would not have retained its postwar wealth. The roomy, wartime financial conduit was there to facilitate this great transaction.

This provision in Annex II, the financial bankers of New York induced the American delegation to the Peace Conference to accept.

This purpose remains to-day the dominant motive of European diplomacy and politics and the preoccupation of the New York bankers. It found a medium of action in the Stresemann policy of 1925 which has culminated in the launching on our markets of the German international 5½ bonds, which I discussed recently in the House of Representatives. Fortunately, we seem to be taking warning against these bonds in time.

Having gotten the provisions of Annex II into the treaty, the international bankers of New York came home to work on this side to put it into execution. The refusal of the Senate to ratify the treaty was a great setback, but the efforts went on just the same. After 1921 the bankers attained control of the State Department and the Treasury Department and have never relaxed their grip upon the policies of these departments. Putting the Stresemann policy into execution in the United States could not be openly accomplished. Its purposes could not be openly avowed. The State and Treasury Departments were in sympathy with it but did not dare publicly to avow this sympathy. They were reduced to the practice of roundabout and rather surreptitious methods to further, gradually, the purposes of the international bankers and the European governments. The State Department has exercised unseen a definite support of the treaty of Versailles in Europe, and the Treasury Department has not made the slightest effort to check the growth of unwarranted practices and powers in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. In all really important negotiations concerning our European relations the State Department has left action to private bankers instead of to the responsible officials.

It secretly favored what was done by the Young committee in 1929, and in order that the Young plan might go into operation without the necessity of treaty settlements which would involve consideration of the whole matter by Congress, it made a special agreement with Germany concerning the German debt to us without which the Young plan could not have been adopted, and which required only a joint resolution of Congress approving it with reference to which general and open debate on the floors of the Congress on the whole subject did not need to be risked. The Young plan in its far-reaching significance falls within the purview of the Congress. It ought to have been fully considered there. But in order that this might be obviated and publicity avoided, the leaders of the organization in Congress in both Houses were summoned to the White House on May 19, 1929, while the Young committee was sitting in Paris, and there induced to agree to what was being done in Europe and to promise favorable action in both the Senate and House of Representatives. The result was that inquiry by individual Senators and Congressmen was smothered when the matter came up for action last year, and a matter which should have had the closest consideration by the Congress was railroaded through without debate.

Gentlemen, it is this subtle influence in every branch of our Government at Washington that is now a menace to the Nation's welfare. It is undoubtedly present and its results are visible. All its purposes converge upon a control of the Federal reserve system and of the political government at Washington, in order that national policy may be controlled by a few men and in the interests primarily of the foreigner. The only way to bring this condition to an end is by action in the Congress where alone the interests of the people are represented.

Now, in closing, let me say that under no circumstances ought the Congress or the people to allow the United States Government to be drawn slowly and by courses which can not be detected by a scrutiny of the public press into virtual alliance with the allied states for the maintenance of the status quo in Europe as it is to-day. Under no circumstances ought the ground be prepared for another American intervention in Europe's wars.

The Bank of International Settlements and the World Court are destined to be the financial and judicial part of the League of Nations.

MUSCLE SHOALS

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD telegrams received from some of my constituents with reference to Muscle Shoals.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

PONTIAC, MICH., *January 10, 1931.*

GRANT HUDSON, *Congressman:*

Our people wish to voice our opposition to Government entering into further public-utility investment and extension of transmission lines, especially referring to Muscle Shoals project.

CRAMER SMITH, *President.*

[Telegram]

DETROIT, MICH., *January 12, 1931.*

Hon. GRANT M. HUDSON,
House of Representatives:

As one of your constituents I strongly urge that you oppose Norris Muscle Shoals bill or any like bill that would cause Government to enter business in competition with private capital.

JOSEPH J. MCFAWN,
Vice President Cray, McFawn & Co.

[Telegram]

PONTIAC, MICH., *January 12, 1931.*

Representative GRANT HUDSON,
House of Representatives:

I think the Federal Government ought to keep out of operating Muscle Shoals. Wouldn't this establish a dangerous precedent?

HAROLD A. FITZGERALD.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PARKS. It is with profound sorrow I feel it is my duty to announce to the Speaker that there is not a quorum here, and I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas makes the point of order there is not a quorum present. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 15]

Aldrich	Cullen	Johnson, Ind.	Reid, Ill.
Auf der Heide	Dempsey	Johnson, Okla.	Rowbottom
Baird	Dorsey	Johnson, S. Dak.	Shaffer, Va.
Beck	Doughton	Jonas, N. C.	Simms
Bell	Douglass, Mass.	Kearns	Sirovich
Blackburn	Doyle	Kelly	Smith, W. Va.
Britten	Fenn	Kemp	Sproul, Kans.
Browne	Fish	Kennedy	Stevenson
Brunner	Fitzpatrick	Kerr	Stobbs
Buckbee	Garrett	Kunz	Sullivan, N. Y.
Butler	Gavagan	McKeown	Sullivan, Pa.
Cable	Golder	Mansfield	Taylor, Colo.
Canfield	Hale	Michaelson	Taylor, Tenn.
Carley	Hastings	Montet	Thompson
Carter, Wyo.	Hawley	Nelson, Wis.	Underwood
Celler	Hoch	Norton	Warren
Chase	Hoffman	O'Connor, La.	Whitehead
Clancy	Hope	O'Connor, N. Y.	Williams
Corning	Hudspeth	Owen	Zihlman
Culkin	James, Mich.	Purnell	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and fifty-two Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15593, the Army appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15593, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CITIZENS' MILITARY TRAINING

RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

For the procurement, maintenance, and issue, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, to institutions at which one or more units of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps are maintained, of such public animals, means of transportation, supplies, tentage, equipment, and uniforms as he may deem necessary, including cleaning and laundering of uniforms and clothing at camps; and to forage, at the expense of the United States, public animals so issued, and to pay commutation in lieu of uniforms at a rate to be fixed annually by the Secretary of War; for transporting said animals and other authorized supplies and equipment from place of issue to the several institutions and training camps and return of same to place of issue when necessary; for purchase of training manuals, including Government publications and blank forms; for the establishment and maintenance of camps for the further practical instruction of the members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for transporting members of such corps to and from such camps, and to subsist them while traveling to and from such camps and while remaining therein so far as appropriations will permit or, in lieu of transporting them to and from such camps and subsisting them while en route, to pay them travel allowance at the rate of 5 cents per mile for the distance by the shortest usually traveled route from the places from which they are authorized to proceed to the camp and for the return travel thereto, and to pay the return travel pay in advance of the actual performance of the travel; for expenses incident to the use, including upkeep and depreciation costs, of supplies, equipment, and matériel furnished in accordance with law from stocks under the control of the War Department; for pay for students attending advanced camps at the rate prescribed for soldiers of the seventh grade of the Regular Army; for the payment of commutation of subsistence to members of the senior division of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, at a rate not exceeding the cost of the garrison ration prescribed for the Army, as authorized in the act approved June 3, 1916, as amended by the act approved June 4, 1920 (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 387); for medical and hospital treatment until return to their homes and further medical treatment after arrival at their homes, subsistence during hospitalization and until furnished transportation to their homes, and transportation when fit for travel to their homes of members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps who suffer personal injury in line of duty while en route to or from and while at camps of instruction under the provisions of section 47a of the national defense act approved June 3, 1916 (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 441), as amended; and for the cost of preparation and transportation to their homes and burial expenses of the remains of members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps who die while attending camps of instruction as provided in the act approved April 26, 1928 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 10, sec. 451); for mileage, traveling expenses, or transportation, for transportation of dependents, and for packing and transportation of baggage, as authorized by law, for officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army traveling on duty pertaining to or on detail to or relief from duty with the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; for the maintenance, repair, and operation of motor vehicles, and for the purchase of 7 motor-propelled trucks, 4 at a cost not exceeding $2,000 each, and 3 at a cost not exceeding $750 each, including for both types the value of a vehicle exchanged, $3,960,000, of which $368,047 shall be available immediately: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War is authorized to issue, without charge, in lieu of purchase, for the use of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, so many horses now belonging to the Regular Army as he may consider desirable: *Provided*, That uniforms and other equipment or material issued to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps in accordance with law shall be furnished from surplus or reserve stocks of the War Department without payment from this appropriation, except for actual expense incurred in the manufacture or issue: *Provided further*, That in no case shall the amount paid from this appropriation for uniforms, equipment, or material furnished to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps from stocks under the control of the War Department be in excess of the price current at the time the issue is made: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used for the organization or maintenance of an additional number of mounted, motor transport, or tank units in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps in excess of the number in existence on January 1, 1928: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated elsewhere in this act, except for printing and binding and pay and allowances of officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, shall be used for expenses in connection with the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I present the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 55, line 25, before the period, insert " : *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used for or toward the support of any compulsory military course or military training in any civil school or college, or for the pay of any officer, enlisted man, or employee at any civil school or college where a military course or military training is compulsory, but nothing herein shall be construed as applying to essentially military schools or colleges."

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It seems to the Chair in a cursory reading of the amendment that it is a negative limitation.

Mr. BARBOUR. It is in the form of a limitation, but one of those limitations that seeks to control the discretion of an administrative officer. It does not limit any fund carried in this bill, it does not mean that there will be any less money expended for these activities, because a change of the entire activity from compulsory military training to voluntary requires exactly the same amount of money to be expended.

It is one of those amendments offered in the form of a limitation which seeks to change existing legislation, and as I said a moment ago restricts the Executive discretion of an administrative officer.

On that point I would like to call the attention of the Chair to certain rulings with which the Chair is familiar, on the general proposition that legislation can not be proposed under the guise of an amendment.

These schools are provided for in the national defense act. This training, compulsory or elective, is provided for in that act. The amendment seeks to change that to the extent that we shall not have any compulsory military training in the schools even though the school executives want it.

Now, particularly, I want to call the attention of the Chair to a ruling by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE], who was in the chair during the Sixty-eighth Congress, second session, and which will be found on page 1497:

The Chair believes he should look through the form to the purpose. So doing, he finds the purpose to be legislative in that the intent is to restrict Executive discretion to a degree that may be fairly termed a change in policy rather than a matter of administrative detail. For this reason he feels it incumbent on himself to sustain the point of order.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is clearly a limitation. Assuming, for the sake of argument only, that what the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR] says is a fact, that money is paid to schools where the training is compulsory, then I submit that that is a violation of the national defense act, which is entirely bare of any compulsory military training, and, to the contrary, specifically provides for voluntary military training. Clearly the decisions are numerous, and there is no question that an amendment which places a limitation on the expenditure of public funds is in order. The Chair will recall that during the discussion of the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia an amendment was placed in the bill limiting the qualifications of teachers in the public schools of the District, entirely contrary to the provisions of existing law, yet that amendment was held to be in order. If my amendment should be held to be out of order, then it would be nullifying all of the precedents of years in this House in respect to amendments that are limitations on appropriation bills.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman answer the Chair in respect to the last part of his amendment, as to whether that does not add additional duties to an executive officer?—

But nothing herein shall be construed as applying to essentially military schools or colleges.

Does not that require an examination into the character of the schools, as to whether or not they are essentially military schools, and does not that add another duty to an executive officers.? Will the gentleman address himself to that?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Not at all. They are classified as such. For instance, there are private schools like the Culver Military Academy or the Staunton Military Academy. I refer to schools or colleges like State universities or other colleges that are not typically military academies. The War Department itself has made this qualification, and if the Chair should hold that I would be willing to strike that portion out. There can be no doubt as to that. That proviso meets the very objection that the gentleman from California states in his point of order. They are purely military colleges. The student who goes there goes with his eyes open and he goes for that purpose. I am taking no appropriation away from those schools. I think there can be no question as to the propriety of that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] is in the form of a negative limitation. It is assumed that it is now authorized by law to appropriate for compulsory military courses or military training in civil schools or colleges. It is also authorized by law to pay an officer, an enlisted man, or an employee at a civil school or college where military training or courses are compulsory. The Chair is unable to find any affirmative direction in this amendment. In effect, it simply refuses to appropriate for purposes which are authorized by law and for which Congress may or may not appropriate as it may see fit. The Chair is constrained to overrule the point of order, because he is unable to find any affirmative direction or any limitation of authority of an executive officer other than a refusal to appropriate for certain purposes for which there is authority of law and for which Congress has heretofore appropriated. It does to a certain extent change a policy of the War Department, but the Chair believes that a change of policy can be made by the failure of Congress to appropriate for an authorized object. The Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to make good to the people of this country statements that have repeatedly been made on the floor of this House, statements made by the War Department, by the Secretary of War, and I believe in several instances by the Presidents of the United States, that we have no compulsory military training in this country. The gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR] himself has solemnly assured the country in statements made on the floor of this House that we, the Federal Government, have no compulsory military training and that we do not appropriate for such a thing. He has often stated that he is not in favor of compulsory military training. That being so, all my amendment does is to restrict the appropriations to such schools where military training is not compulsory. That is all it does. It does not take one cent away from the clearly essential military schools, because if a boy wants to go to that kind of a school he goes there with the desire to obtain military training. If Congress wants to provide funds for such private schools, it can do so. If private military schools get any aid or appropriation from the Federal Government, my amendment does not disturb those schools; but in State schools, maintained by the States, or colleges where boys go, we should carry out the spirit of the national defense act, that the military training shall be optional. That is all there is to it. It will not take one cent away from any school or college where the training is optional, and, as I said before, we have declared to the country that we are appropriating this money for schools where the military training is optional. We have to keep faith with the people of the country. If any school compels its students to follow these courses in order to obtain Federal aid, then they have no complaint if we limit the funds to be appropriated or expended in accordance with the spirit of the law and the intention of Congress.

I am merely following the lead of the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR], who has repeatedly stated that there is nothing in the law or the appropriation where military training is compulsory. I have waited patiently year after year. The gentleman is not at fault, the War Department is not at fault, the Congress is not at fault. Various schools and colleges are making military training compulsory. That being so, let us write the intention and spirit of the law into this appropriation and put an end to a system of compulsory military service in this country.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The gentleman speaks of an option. Who exercises that option?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The student himself, except in essentially military schools, like the Staunton Military Academy, Culver Academy, Virginia Military Institute, and other essentially military schools.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Suppose there is a high school in a city, and through the regulations of the city there is compulsory military training in that school. The school itself can not control it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No. But we can by refusing Federal aid and public funds out of the United States Treasury for that school.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The individual student can say whether he will participate or not.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is all. That is the purpose of my amendment.

Mr. McSWAIN. I would like very much to have the gentleman's definition of what he means by strictly or exclusively military school.

For instance, in South Carolina we have a school known as The Citadel, which has been in existence as a military school for over a hundred years.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And the students wear uniforms all the time?

Mr. McSWAIN. Oh, yes; all the time. They have no other clothes with them.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. There is no question about that being a military school. It would not be affected by this amendment.

Mr. McSWAIN. What about the land-grant college—the Clemson Agricultural and Mechanical College—where they wear uniforms all the time just in the same way? They get up in the morning by the bugle and they go to bed by taps.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It is not compulsory in the land-grant college. Am I not correct about that? I ask the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLLINS. It can be optional in the land-grant college.

Mr. BARBOUR. It is optional in the land-grant school.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Then my amendment would apply to land-grant schools.

Mr. YON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. YON. In Florida in the university there is a corps there and we have an officer in charge of training detailed to that school. What bearing would this amendment have on a school of that sort?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is the training compulsory or voluntary? If it is voluntary, it would not affect it. If it is compulsory, it would get no funds under this amendment.

Mr. YON. If it is compulsory through the curriculum of the school?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Exactly. That is the purpose of my amendment, gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] has expired.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, because it seeks to limit or control the activities of schools and colleges throughout the country by a limitation on an appropriation bill without having gone into the matter and given the authorities of these

various schools and colleges an opportunity to be heard. It seeks to change the purpose and intent of the national defense act which provides, among other things, for the establishment of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps units.

The national defense act contains this provision:

That except at State institutions described in this section, no unit shall be established or maintained in an educational institution until the authorities of the same agree to establish and maintain a two years' elective or compulsory course of military training as a minimum for its physically fit male students, which course, when entered upon by any student, shall, as regards such student, be a prerequisite for graduation unless he is relieved of this obligation by regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of War.

The national defense act leaves it entirely up to the school authorities to determine whether this training shall be elective or compulsory.

I think we should go a little slowly in changing this program that has been in effect for the past several years, ever since the enactment of the national defense act. It is a part of the whole scheme and program of maintaining something that is somewhere near an adequate national defense. I feel certain if any of the Members of this House have within the past three days read the first three chapters of General Pershing's experiences in the World War they will realize that these are matters about which we should proceed very slowly and be rather certain of our ground.

The effect of this amendment will be to wipe out of existence half or more than half of the existing Reserve Officers' Training Corps units throughout the schools and colleges of the United States unless they immediately change their plan of military training from compulsory to elective. They can not benefit by one dollar of this appropriation if this amendment is adopted and they have compulsory military training.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is the gentleman in favor of compulsory military training?

Mr. BARBOUR. No. But, in so far as these schools are concerned, I am in favor of leaving it to the school authorities to determine what they want in the way of educational facilities for their students. I do not see anything terrible in requiring a high-school student to spend a little time in military training. I have been through that. It did not do any harm to me that I have ever been able to observe. It is good physical education. It straightens a man up and throws his shoulders back and deepens his chest and it is good for him in a physical way. Nobody has ever been known to suffer because he took a year or two of military training, either elective or compulsory. But it is a matter that should be left to the school authorities themselves, and we here in Washington should not try to control it.

I would like to call attention to some of the schools that will be affected by this. Let us take the First Corps Area, which is composed of the New England States, and then the other corps areas.

I shall insert a table showing just what schools and colleges will be affected.

List of schools and colleges having Reserve Officers' Training Corps units

	Elective or required military training	Total enrolled	Drawing commutation		Receiving issue uniforms		Drawing neither	
			Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance
FIRST CORPS AREA								
Senior units								
Connecticut Agricultural College [1]	Required	288		41	247			
Yale University	Elective	271	162	107				2
University of Maine [1]	Required	622		32	590			
Boston University	Elective	528		37	491			
Harvard Medical School	do	86					43	43
Harvard University	do	224		54	148			22
Massachusetts Agricultural College [1]	Required	137		22	115			
Massachusetts Institute of Technology [1]	do	1,472		269	1,168			35
University of New Hampshire [1]	do	627		85	542			
Rhode Island State College [1]	do	312		41	271			
Norwich University	do	308	192	116				
University of Vermont [1]	do	477	329	40			73	35
Total		5,352	683	844	3,572		116	137
Junior, class SM units			Junior		Junior		Junior	
Bangor High School	Required	288			288			
Gloucester High School	do	306			306			
New Bedford High School	Elective	170			170			
Total		764			764			
			Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance
SECOND CORPS AREA								
Senior units								
University of Delaware [1]	Required	330		44	285			1
Princeton University	Elective	617	433	184				
Rutgers University [1]	Required	663		83	580			
Albany Medical College	do	84					65	19
College of the City of New York	Elective	963		63	900			
Cornell University [1]	Required	2,140	1,798	269			52	21
Fordham University	Elective	183		26	157			
New York University	Required	1,126		66	804		227	29
Syracuse University	Elective	451		77	374			
University of Buffalo	do	70					40	30
University of Porto Rico [1]	Required	387			358	29		
Total		7,014	2,231	812	3,458	29	384	100
Junior, class M units			Junior		Junior		Junior	
Bordentown Military Institute	Required	110					101	
La Salle Military Academy	do	151			151			
New York Military Academy	do	291					291	
The Manlius School	do	261					261	
Total		813			151		662	

[1] Land grant.

List of schools and colleges having Reserve Officers' Training Corps units—Continued

	Elective or required military training	Total enrolled	Drawing commutation		Receiving issue uniforms		Drawing neither	
			Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance
THIRD CORPS AREA								
Senior units								
Georgetown University	Elective	458		38	223		157	40
George Washington University	do	166					103	63
Howard University	Required	305		49	256			
Johns Hopkins University	Elective	422	299	63			40	20
University of Maryland [1]	Required	586		48	538			
Western Maryland College	do	160	119	41				
Carnegie Institute of Technology	Elective	374		94	280			
Drexel Institute	Required	688		52	636			
Gettysburg College	Elective	170		26	144			
Jefferson Medical College	do	254					165	89
Lafayette College	do	207		26	181			
Lehigh University	Required	836			743	93		
Pennsylvania Military College	do	131					91	40
Pennsylvania State College [1]	do	2,118		107	2,011			
University of Pennsylvania	Elective	613	161	71			259	122
University of Pittsburgh	do	590	346	60			126	58
Medical College of Virginia	do	103					55	48
Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical and Polytechnic Institute [1]	Required	1,124	786	338				
Virginia Military Institute	do	673	442	231				
Total		9,978	2,153	1,244	5,012	93	996	480
			Junior		Junior		Junior	
Junior, class M units								
Valley Forge Military Academy	Required	209						209
Augusta Military Academy	do	272						272
Blackstone, a Military School for Boys	do	98						98
Fishburne Military School	do	133						133
Fork Union Military Academy	do	144						144
Massanutten Academy	do	116						116
Staunton Military Academy	do	516						516
Total		1,488						1,488
FOURTH CORPS AREA			Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance
Senior units								
Alabama Polytechnic Institute [1]	Required	1,145	878	267				
University of Alabama	do	1,644	1,512	132				
University of Florida [1]	do	1,208		140	1,068			
Georgia School of Technology	do	1,393	1,141	222				30
North Georgia Agriculture College	do	122			87	35		
University of Georgia [1]	do	758		146	602			10
Louisiana State University [1]	do	762	627	133			2	
Mississippi Agricultural and Mechanical College [1]	do	836	689	147				
Davidson College	do	386		53	333			
North Carolina State College [1]	do	891		123	768			
Clemson Agriculture College [1]	do	1,106	746	360				
Presbyterian College	do	171	120	51				
The Citadel	do	590	332	242			14	2
Wofford College	Elective	237		90	147			
University of Tennessee [1]	Required	739	590	102			18	29
Vanderbilt University School of Medicine	Elective	115					67	48
Total		12,103	6,635	2,208	3,005	35	101	119

[1] Land grant.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Does this amendment cut out the required colleges?

Mr. BARBOUR. All the required schools are just wiped out, and they will not get any of the money appropriated under this bill unless they change from compulsory to elective.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Then I am against the amendment.

Mr. BARBOUR. I want you gentlemen to know what the effect is going to be on your own institutions.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. In all fairness I think it should be stated that these schools could change their present system and make military training elective, and in that event they will enjoy the benefit of these appropriations.

Mr. BARBOUR. I say, unless they change from compulsory to elective training they will not get the benefit of these appropriations. I made that statement to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. CLARK of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Maryland. If military training is required, we will say, at Howard University, does that make military training compulsory? In other words, no one has to go——

Mr. BARBOUR. To Howard University.

Mr. CLARK of Maryland. If a man goes to Howard University and knows that military training is required, can you say that is compulsory?

Mr. BARBOUR. I do not think so, any more than saying that higher algebra is compulsory or any other subject that is prescribed in the school curriculum. It would apply to one the same as to the other.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, before the regents of the University of Wisconsin——

Mr. BARBOUR. That is the institution which is always right, according to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STAFFORD. Well, of course, the gentleman from New York knows more about it than anybody else.

Mr. BARBOUR. Except as to football.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would not except football. I would say that with respect to football it would be of superior rank. Before the regents of the University of Wisconsin made it optional for the students to take military training it was compulsory on everyone in that institution to take it by edict of the board of regents.

Mr. BARBOUR. Just the same as the students were required to take other subjects which are compulsory.

Mr. STAFFORD. Let me say to the gentleman from California that the trend of our colleges to-day is not to make anything compulsory.

Mr. BARBOUR. Let me say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that every other institution should have the same right as the University of Wisconsin and determine for itself whether the training should be compulsory or elective.

Mr. STAFFORD. As far as I am concerned, if I could, I would wipe out all appropriations as far as high schools are concerned. I do not believe high-school boys should be compelled to have militaristic ideas instilled into their heads while they are in a plastic stage, and when I was a member of the subcommittee of which the gentleman is now a member we were seriously considering striking out that appropriation as far as high schools are concerned.

Mr. BARBOUR. Then let me say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that he can introduce a bill providing for an amendment to the national defense act which will do that very thing and have it considered by his own committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. But we can do it more directly by limiting the appropriation.

Mr. BARBOUR. I want you gentlemen to get the effect of this amendment on the institutions in your sections of the country.

Mr. CLARK of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Maryland. Is the definition of compulsory military training, as mentioned here, the accepted definition by the department?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, in view of the interruptions, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARBOUR. Now, let us go to the Fifth Corps Area, and I want every gentleman present to hear how this amendment will affect the schools in the various sections of the country.

List of schools and colleges having Reserve Officers' Training Corps units

	Elective or required military training	Total enrolled	Drawing commutation		Receiving issue uniforms		Drawing neither	
			Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance
FIFTH CORPS AREA								
Senior units								
Culver Military Academy	Required	567	413	154				
Depauw University	Elective	223		61	162			
Indiana University	Required	997	911	85				1
Purdue University [1]	do	2,049		259	1,790			
Rose Polytechnic Institute	do	239		33	206			
University of Kentucky [1]	do	1,224		162	1,062			
Ohio State University [1]	do	3,736	3,147	215			233	141
University of Akron	do	403		51	340			12
University of Cincinnati	do	1,148		219	871			58
University of Dayton	do	201		29	172			
Western Reserve University	Elective	110					63	47
Wilberforce University	Required	106			88	18		
West Virginia University [1]	do	812		99	713			
Total		11,815	4,471	1,367	6,315	18	296	259
Junior, class M units			Junior		Junior		Junior	
Howe Military School	Required	149						148
Kentucky Military Institute	do	148						148
Greenbrier Pres. Military School	do	244						244
Total		541						541
Junior, class SM units								
Gary High School	Elective	209			209			
Indianapolis High Schools	do	1,410			1,410			
Louisville Male High School	do	725			725			
Owensboro High School	Required	195			195			
Western Kentucky State Teachers' College	Elective	101			101			
Total		2,640			2,640			
SIXTH CORPS AREA			Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance
Senior units								
Knox College	Elective	155		34	121			
Northwestern University	do	196					117	79
University of Chicago	do	307		78	142		50	37
University of Illinois [1]	Required	3,577		426	3,151			
Michigan College of Mining	Elective	165	129	36				
Michigan State College [1]	Required	1,327		177	1,150			
University of Michigan	Elective	393	293	100				
Ripon College	Required	194		43	151			
University of Wisconsin [1]	Elective	624	508	111			2	3
Total		6,938	930	1,005	4,715		169	119
Junior, class M units			Junior		Junior		Junior	
Illinois Military School	Required	145					145	
Morgan Park Military Academy	do	250			250			
Northwestern Military and Naval Academy	do	162			162			
St. John's Military Academy	do	348					348	
Western Military Academy	do	225					225	
Total		1,130			412		718	

[1] Land grant.

List of schools and colleges having Reserve Officers' Training Corps units—Continued

	Elective or required military training	Total enrolled	Drawing commutation		Receiving issue uniforms		Drawing neither	
			Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance
SIXTH CORPS AREA—continued			Junior		Junior		Junior	
Junior, class SM units								
Chicago High Schools	Elective	5,311			5,311			
Joliet Township High School	do	136			136			
Rockford High School	do	280			280			
Waukegan Township High School	Required	508			508			
A. D. Johnston High School	Elective	106			106			
Calumet Public High Schools	do	197			197			
Detroit High Schools	do	1,218			1,218			
Grand Rapids High Schools	do	280			280			
Beloit High Schools	do	104			104			
Campion College	Required	214			214			
Total		8,354			8,354			
			Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance
SEVENTH CORPS AREA								
Senior units								
Ouachita College	Required	116		41	74			1
University of Arkansas [1]	do	581		85	496			
Coe College	do	271		44	227			
Iowa State College [1]	do	1,437		145	1,217		53	22
State University of Iowa	do	1,373	1,106	103			59	105
Municipal University of Wichita	Elective	167	130	37				
Kansas State Agricultural College [1]	Required	1,246		82	1,133			31
University of Kansas	Elective	317	247	70				
University of Minnesota [1]	Required	3,398	3,060	247				91
Missouri School of Mines	do	349		47	302			
St. Louis University School of Medicine	do	497					392	105
University of Missouri [1]	do	1,108	996	112				
Washington University	Elective	380	199	40			81	60
Creighton University	Required	485	391	26			36	32
University of Nebraska [1]	do	1,698		143	1,555			
North Dakota Agricultural College [1]	do	634	563	71				
University of North Dakota	do	516		71	444			1
South Dakota State College [1]	do	530		81	449			
University of South Dakota [1]	do	341	288	53				
Total		15,444	6,980	1,498	5,897		621	448
Junior, class M units			Junior		Junior		Junior	
St. Thomas Military Academy	Required	256					256	
Shattuck School	do	242					242	
Kemper Military School	do	336			336			
Missouri Military Academy	do	140					140	
Wentworth Military Academy	do	238					238	
Total		1,212			3,364		876	
Junior, class SM units								
Council Bluffs High School	Required	559			559			
Davenport High School	Elective	326			326			
Leavenworth High School	Required	188			188			
Cretin High School	do	557			557			
Joplin High School	Elective	312			312			
Kansas City High Schools	do	1,859			1,859			
St. Joseph High Schools	Required	571			571			
South Dakota State College	do	166			66			
Total		4,538			4,538			
			Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance
EIGHTH CORPS AREA								
Senior units								
University of Arizona [1]	Required	502		92	410			
Colorado Agricultural College [1]	do	599		56	543			
Colorado School of Mines	Required	403		142	261			
New Mexico State College [1]	do	229		45	184			
New Mexico Military Institute	do	492	414	66			12	
Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College [1]	do	1,508		84	1,424			
Oklahoma Military Academy	do	223			211	12		
University of Oklahoma [1]	do	1,592		267	1,325			
Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas [1]	do	2,432	1,872	560				
Baylor University College of Medicine	Elective	164					109	55
Total		8,144	2,286	1,312	4,358	12	121	55
Junior class M units			Junior		Junior		Junior	
Allen Academy	Required	188			188			
Texas Military Institute	do	147			147			
Total		335			355			

[1] Land grant

List of school and colleges having Reserve Officers' Training Corps unite—Continued

	Elective or required military training	Total enrolled	Drawing commutation		Receiving issue uniforms		Drawing neither	
			Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance
EIGHTH CORPS AREA—continued			Junior		Junior		Junior	
Junior class SM units								
Phoenix Union High School	Elective	200			200			
Canon City High School	Required	140			140			
Dallas high schools	Elective	1,576			1,576			
El Paso High School	do	259			259			
Fort Worth High School	do	465			465			
San Antonio High School	do	521			521			
Total		3,161			3,161			
NINTH CORPS AREA			Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance
Senior units								
Leland Stanford Junior University	Elective	362		114	248			
Pomona College	do	118		34	84			
University of California, Berkeley [1]	Required [2]	1,615		242	1,276		54	43
University of California at Los Angeles	do	1,151		138	1,013			
University of Idaho [1]	do	623		79	544			
Montana State College [1]	do	431		22	409			
University of Montana	do	353		22	331			
University of Nevada [1]	do	202		12	190			
North Pacific College of Oregon	do	118					83	35
Oregon Agricultural College [1]	do	1,259		140	1,119			
University of Oregon	do	839		55	680		67	37
Utah State Agricultural College [1]	do	464		26	438			
University of Utah	Elective	610		90	520			
State College of Washington [1]	Required	1,209		76	1,133			
University of Washington	do	1,228	1,128	98			2	
University of Wyoming [1]	do	386		42	344			
Total		10,968	1,128	1,190	8,329		206	115
Junior class M units			Junior		Junior		Junior	
San Diego Army and Navy Academy	Required	225					225	
The Harvard School	do	175					175	
Total		400					400	
Junior class SM units								
Alameda High School	Elective	250			250			
Los Angeles High Schools	do	1,579			1,579			
Loyola High School	Required	180			180			
Oakland Public High School	Elective	1,340			1,340			
Pasadena Junior College	do	144			144			
Polytechnic High School, Long Beach	do	143			143			
Polytechnic High School and Junior College, Riverside	do	180			180			
Santa Barbara High School	Required	210			210			
San Diego High School	Elective	355			355			
San Francisco High Schools	do	1,250			1,250			
Boise High School	do	170			170			
Reno High School	do	190			190			
Ogden Senior High School	Required	370			370			
Salt Lake City High School	do	1,014			1,014			
Walla Walla High School	do	275			275			
Cheyenne High School	do	170			170			
Total		7,820			7,820			
HAWAIIAN DEPARTMENT			Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance	Basic	Advance
Senior unit								
University of Hawaii [1]	Required	348		50	298			
Junior class M units								
Kamehameha School	do	207			207			
Junior class SM units								
McKinley High School	do	807			807			
Punahou Academy	do	150			150			
Total		957						

[1] Land grant.
[2] Except for medicine.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have just mentioned particularly the colleges, the institutions of higher learning.

This shows just what the effect of this amendment is going to be if we adopt it and put it on this bill without giving these schools and colleges a chance to consider the matter for themselves. I am not averse to any school or college changing its military course from compulsory to elective. Some of the finest institutions in this country, in my opinion, have an elective military course; but let the schools do it themselves. They know what is best for their students better than we do, and I am not one of those persons who is scared or alarmed because of a year or two of compulsory military training.

Mr. DICKINSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. DICKINSON. The gentleman has read statistics from various schools and I would like to know the percentage of pupils taking military training where it is elec-

tive as compared with the percentage of military students where it is required.

Mr. BARBOUR. I will say to the gentleman that there is a column in the table showing the strength of the various units at the various schools and colleges.

Mr. DICKINSON. I was under the impression that wherever it is elective, you would find a much smaller percentage of the students taking military training.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But with better results.

Mr. BARBOUR. No; not necessarily with better results.

Mr. DICKINSON. I do not know as to that.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing the whole table that I have been reading from in the RECORD. This will show the total enrollment and other information in regard to the units at the various schools. I think it would be enlightening if the complete table went in, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to include this as an extension of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ARENTZ). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARBOUR. I now yield to the gentleman from New York, if I have the time.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman kindly state to the committee the fact that this appropriation bill does not go into effect until July 1, 1931?

Mr. BARBOUR. That is true.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And all of these schools, by changing from required to elective, could receive the appropriations if they could get the students to enroll.

Mr. BARBOUR. But they must change from compulsory to elective and do it by July 1 next.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is just the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. BARBOUR. I think the gentleman from New York and I are agreed on the facts in the matter.

Mr. GIBSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. GIBSON. The gentleman in reading the list of institutions in the First Corps Area named Norwich University.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute in order that I may answer the question of the gentleman from Vermont.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for one minute.

Mr. GIBSON. I happen to be vice president of that institution. We have been training young men there since 1819.

Mr. BARBOUR. And they have a very fine cavalry unit there.

Mr. GIBSON. I want to know how that institution would be affected under the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA].

Mr. BARBOUR. I will say to the gentleman from Vermont that you would have to change your plan of military training at Norwich University from required to elective or you would not get any money under this bill after the 1st day of July.

Mr. GIBSON. Then if a young man enters that institution he could elect whether he would take military training or not?

Mr. BARBOUR. If you change it, yes; but as it is now it is required.

Mr. PATTERSON. Will the distinguished chairman yield to me for a question?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes; if I have the time.

Mr. PATTERSON. What effect would this have on the amount of money which the institutions would receive? In other words, where they have 2,000 students enrolled under the compulsory system, if they should make it elective and reduce the number of students to 500, would they get less money?

Mr. BARBOUR. The individual school would get less money, and they would not get any money unless they made it elective.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be again reported.

The Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I think this amendment offered by the gentleman from New York raises a question of importance as broad and far-reaching as that of any which has been presented to this House for a long time.

The gentleman from California has read an extended list of colleges where compulsory military training is part of the program, and has frankly stated that unless between now and the 1st day of next July those colleges change what is now a compulsory military training to an elective system of training, they can not participate in any of the appropriations herein proposed to be made.

This does not leave the choice with the individual student in these colleges. There is many a boy who wants to go to the college that is near his home, accessible and available. He may not want to take military training, but he must go to this particular college and there he finds that military training is compulsory. He takes it. He is obliged to take it.

Now, do we want to commit this Congress to a policy of compulsory military training of the youth of America? This is the question you and I must answer right now on the vote on this amendment.

This Nation of ours has asked Europe to accept the Kellogg peace pact. We pose as a Nation which throws its vast influence in the scales for peace.

Are you going to permit the nations abroad when they are figuring out what they are going to do in the way of military preparation—and there is so much military preparation abroad for the next war—are you going to allow them to point their finger at us and say, "In the debate in the United States House of Representatives recently Congress committed itself to a policy of compulsory military training and forbade any institution of learning to participate in a dollar of appropriation unless they had compulsory military training"? I tell you, my friends, I want to get this thought before this House: Just as long as we are bringing our boys up in a military training, dressing them up in uniform, adding glory to all the preparations of war, breeding the psychology of war in the coming generation, we are following a course utterly inconsistent with a peace program. [Applause.]

I am not a pacifist. I believe in the national defense act. I believe in proper training of men that we may be ready in the time of emergency to act in defense of what is right and just. But I am opposed to legislation which, to say the least, encourages the appropriation of the general funds for the benefit of educational institutions which adhere to a system of compulsory military training. [Applause.]

Mr. BARBOUR. They do not have to do that.

Mr. BEEDY. What do they have to do?

Mr. BARBOUR. They do it of their own accord.

Mr. BEEDY. When will they have a greater opportunity to make a change than they will have before the 1st of next July?

Mr. BARBOUR. Give them a reasonable chance. Why does not the gentleman go to these institutions in the State of Maine, for instance, and tell them what you have told us here and let them decide the question for themselves?

Mr. BEEDY. I am not dictating to any institution of learning. But if you gentlemen are going to vote against the pending amendment, how are you going to escape the charge that you favor compulsory military training?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARBOUR. Now, if the gentleman will yield, let me take two institutions. There is the University of Maine, which requires military training. There is Yale University in the State of Connecticut that has an elective course in military training. They both benefit by this appropriation and each university determines for itself what its course shall be. Maine University has the compulsory training and Yale University chooses the elective. Is there any reason why Maine can not change from compulsory to elective if it should so decide? They know very well that they can.

That is the way it should be, and we should not dictate to the University of Maine that it should change its policy in regard to military training.

Mr. BEEDY. That sounds all right as far as it goes.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEEDY. Yes.

Mr. COLLINS. The gentleman from California knows that in his own State an institution undertook to make the military course elective, and that the War Department withdrew the funds from the institution.

Mr. BARBOUR. I do not know that.

Mr. BEEDY. That is an important statement. Is the gentleman prepared to back up that statement that when once an institution of learning changes from compulsory military training to elective, the War Department says that it can not have any of this money?

Mr. COLLINS. That was the testimony before the Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. BARBOUR. Oh, there are dozens of schools that are elective and are getting the money. I know nothing of the facts about this institution that the gentleman from Mississippi talks about.

Mr. COLLINS. The gentleman heard the same testimony that I did.

Mr. BARBOUR. But it was not verified. It was the statement of a man proposing this amendment before our committee.

Mr. COLLINS. It was not disputed. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. BARBOUR. It does not have to be disputed. If it is true, it never made a ripple in my State.

Mr. BEEDY. Let me ask the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR] a question. Does he think the pending amendment has any significance or effect?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. BEEDY. What is it?

Mr. BARBOUR. Take the gentleman's own University of Maine. Unless the University of Maine changes its course from compulsory to elective between now and the 1st of July, it will get no money whatever under this bill, no help from the Army in the way of officers, no contribution to the advanced students such as is given to the institution at this time. There may be time for the University of Maine to change its policy between now and the 1st of July, but rather than our forcing the University of Maine to change its policy, let it have the right to change its own policy, let it pass upon this question without our undertaking to determine its policy and forcing its hand.

Mr. BEEDY. I can not see why that is not a 2-edged sword. If you vote against this amendment I can not see why we are not making it needless for that institution to change its policy. It does seem to me when the welfare of mankind hangs in the balance, and we are setting an example for future generations, that we ought to be very careful lest any action taken here be justly construed as one favoring the compulsory training of our youth for future wars. [Applause.]

Mr. BARBOUR. I say to you gentlemen that in this bill we are seeking to carry out the provisions of the national defense act. Congress has determined this policy, not this committee.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But this is Congress.

Mr. BARBOUR. That has been the policy for years. If you want to change this policy, if you think that the Reserve Officers' Training Corps organizations in the schools and colleges make us a militaristic nation, then amend the national defense act and change that.

Mr. BEEDY. Is the gentleman himself in favor of compulsory military training?

Mr. BARBOUR. No; but that question does not enter into it at all.

Mr. BEEDY. Oh, but it does.

Mr. BARBOUR. It does only so far as the individual institution is concerned, but not as a national policy.

Mr. BEEDY. Is the gentleman in favor of this Congress taking any action which could be construed as supporting compulsory military training in our schools and colleges?

Mr. BARBOUR. I am in favor of maintaining the situation just as it is at the present time and letting the schools determine their own policies.

Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am not one who is opposed to preparedness. [Applause.]

Mr. BEEDY. Nor am I.

Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania. But I am certainly in favor of this amendment, and I shall tell you why. I happen to be a member of the Board of Education of the City and County of Philadelphia, that has enrolled about 34,000 high-school students. I happen to be secretary and treasurer of a great university in the city of Philadelphia that has an enrolled membership of about 14,000 students. I am going to speak from the standpoint, first, of the educator on this question of compulsory military training in our schools and colleges. In both the institutions or organizations that I am connected with it is optional, but those of us who have committed to our care the education of the youth of America are at our wits' ends to know how to deal with the various problems that confront us on which we must educate the children and to decide how to discard those subjects that we consider not important enough to embody in our curriculum. There is not an educator of consequence in the United States—and I think I can say this without fear of contradiction—who would not say that he is unalterably opposed to military training being compulsory in our schools and colleges. [Applause.] I am not speaking as a layman, but I am speaking as a man who has devoted 20 years of his life to education in the great city of Philadelphia, and I know exactly how educators in other parts of the United States view this problem. When you introduce compulsory military training in the schools and colleges, or permit it or require it in order that the school may receive a Federal appropriation, you are disorganizing the whole machinery of the educational part of the institution's work, and I am one who believes that the education of America to-day should be democratic, that we should not teach military science in our free citizenship institutions. [Applause.] If we are going to teach military training, let us confine it to the military colleges and to the student training camps.

For those organizations I will vote for every dollar that the War Department needs, but I plead with you in the interest of higher education not to permit the military-training course to be forced upon us. The men and women who are in charge of these institutions, on account of the multitudinous things we are asked to teach the youth, must discriminate and discard the things that are not essential to real education. Do not require us, in order to get an appropriation for our military corps, to make it compulsory on our students. So much for the educational side of it.

I introduced a bill to the same effect as this amendment four years ago, and exhaustive hearings were held before the Committee on Military Affairs. It was testified in those hearings that there were over 300 high schools and colleges in the United States requiring military training.

Those of us who were in the training camps in 1917 know that as far as military value is concerned that kind of military training does not amount to anything. Am I right or

wrong? [Applause.] It does not amount to anything. I can take a company of 190 men and in five weeks' intensive training in any camp give them more instruction than they will ever get in the military course of any of our schools or colleges in three or four years. The training is of little military value. The real purpose back of this is psychological. It is desired to create in the minds of the youth of America the military viewpoint. It is not for the military science they are going to learn, but it is the military psychology that they want to instill in the minds of the American youth. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, so much for the purely educational feature of this question.

Now, I want to pass to something that is far above the educational feature, and that is the spiritual note that is struck when this question is discussed.

I am not one who is so materialistic and who depends so much upon the strong arm of might that I can not recognize that there is a superior force known as the great spiritual law of life and the spiritual nature of man. Anything which pollutes the mind of youth and drives him from the high plane of the spiritual outlook upon his relationship with his fellow man at home and abroad sets aside that supreme law that should govern humanity. [Applause.]

I want to strike that spiritual note to-day by reading to you something that has been said on this question by those who have authority to speak on that higher plane. They are the Disciples' Convention, Memphis, Tenn., 1926; the Northern Baptist Convention, June, 1926; the National Council of the Congregational Churches of the United States, Omaha, 1927; General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States of America, 1928; Presbyterian General Assembly, 1926; Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America, 1926; General Synod of the Reformed Church of America, 1930; Western Unitarian Conference, Cincinnati, 1930; Society for the Advancement of Judaism, March, 1926; Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, 1926; National Council of Student Young Men's Christian Association, 1926; International Convention of Disciples of Christ, 1930; Central Conference of Jewish Rabbis, 1928; World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches, adopted at the annual meeting at St. Louis, 1927, readopted at the annual meeting in New York, 1928; National Study Conference on the Churches and World Peace, February, 1930.

Then come the great educational bodies: The American Physical Education Association; the National Education Association, department of superintendence; representatives of the educational institutions throughout the length and breadth of the land.

The World Federation of Educational Associations, in August, 1929; American Federation of Teachers, in 1929; the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, June, 1920; National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teacher Association; Camp Fire Girls; the American Federation of Labor.

Representatives of the American Federation of Labor came before that committee and said that in the convention in Atlantic City, where there were over 600 delegates present, a resolution was unanimously adopted recommending the support of legislation to prohibit compulsory military training in the schools and colleges.

The Farmer-Labor Party; the National Grange, Seattle, November, 1929; the New York State Federation of Labor in 1929; the National Farmers' Union Convention, Denver, Colo.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania. Here is the National Council of Jewish Women, the Federation of Women's Board of Foreign Missions of North America.

Is there any list that could be compiled of organizations better fitted to speak for the soul of America than the list I have named there?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania. If they can not speak for the soul of America, for the aspiration of our people, then there is no organization of human beings who can so speak. I am not ashamed to raise my voice, both as an educator and as one who tries to be a Christian, against any compulsory military training in the schools and colleges. [Applause.] I say that notwithstanding the fact that I am a member of a religious faith opposed to war. And yet, if war were to break out to-morrow I would consider it my duty to raise my hand in the national defense. I will never withhold my voice or my vote on any appropriation that these United States will need for the purpose of our national security, but when it comes to pollution of the minds of the youth, when it comes to destroying the efforts of the Christian people of this country to raise our young people to something higher and better than that which has gone before, I say the time has now come to try to obtain a declaration on the part of this House which will be declaratory of that for which we stand. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks by inserting these resolutions in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ON MILITARY TRAINING SHOWING THE ATTITUDES OF VARIOUS BODIES AS OFFICIALLY EXPRESSED IN RESOLUTIONS

THE ATTITUDES OF ORGANIZED RELIGIOUS BODIES

Disciples' Convention, Memphis, November 11–17, 1926

Whereas our people are committed to the principle of no conscription in times of peace: Be it

Resolved, (1) That we oppose all compulsory military training in the colleges, universities, and high schools of this country; (2) that we congratulate the colleges of the Disciples of Christ on the absence of all military training on their campuses.

Northern Baptist Convention, June, 1926

Resolved, That we once more express our conviction that war is contrary to the spirit and teachings of Jesus; that we are opposed to war as a method of settlement of international disputes; and that we declare our irrevocable determination to substitute the arbitrament of law, reason, and conciliation for that of slaughter; and we rejoice in every effort put forth in the interests of a just peace; that we urge all men to ally themselves with efforts for the peaceable settlement of national disputes; and that we look with disfavor upon compulsory military training in our colleges and high schools.

National Council of the Congregational Churches of the United States, Omaha, Nebr., May 25–June 1, 1927

By a vote of 200 to 20, the national council adopted the following resolution against compulsory military training in public schools and colleges:

Whereas compulsory military training in our schools and colleges fosters a general attitude of mind conducive to militarism and sole reliance on force and gives ground for other nations to question the peaceful purposes of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Council of the Congregational Churches, assembled in Omaha, condemns both in theory and practice any compulsory military training in public schools or in tax-supported or land-grant institutions of higher learning; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge congressional action to release all instructors in optional courses in military science from the direct control of the War Department to the regularly constituted local academic authorities, thus effectually freeing our educational system from the control or influence of the War Department.

General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America, Kansas City, Mo., May, 1928, passed the following resolution by a vote of 800 to 50

We are opposed to all military training in high schools and to compulsory military training in colleges and universities.

Presbyterian General Assembly, June, 1926

We also put ourselves on record as opposed to all militarism in spirit and in propaganda. We favor such voluntary drill and training as may seem wise to students and their parents for pur-

poses of precision, obedience, and team work, but we are opposed to forcing students in high schools, colleges, and universities to any form of military organization or exercise.

Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America, Walton, N. Y., June, 1926

This synod declares its opposition to compulsory military training in high schools, colleges, and universities of the United States as unnecessary and conducive only to a militaristic spirit in the coming generation.

General Synod of the Reformed Church in America, June, 1930

We urge the people of our churches to stand with the educators against the programs of enlarged and popularized military training in schools and colleges, and to advocate a more effective constructive program for citizenship through educational processes.

Western Unitarian Conference, Cincinnati, May, 1930

Whereas the United States, through the Kellogg peace pact, now a part of the highest law of the land, has renounced war as an instrument of national policy, and has taken active steps toward the reduction of arms: Be it

Resolved, That we, the members of this Western Unitarian Conference, express our hearty sympathy with the 2,000 men students at the University of Iowa who have petitioned that military training in the university be put on a voluntary basis, and have appealed to the general public for support: And be it further

Resolved, That we express our opposition to military training in our high schools and to compulsory military training in either high school or college.

Society for the Advancement of Judaism, March, 1926

The Society for the Advancement of Judaism has followed with great interest your campaign against compulsory military training in the colleges. The members of the society want to go on record as indorsing unanimously your stand and your views on militarism in the civilian schools and colleges. It believes with you that the only road to peace is to create a mind set for peace by stressing and spreading the peace psychology. It can see in compulsory military training an insidious method of nurturing and fostering an urge for national self-expression through war and conquest.

Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, May, 1926

1. That systematic and technical military training for youth of high-school age is to be deplored as foreign to the aims and ideals of our educational system.

2. That civilian educational institutions should not make military training a required subject.

3 That churches and educational leaders give careful study to the whole question of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps in the school and college.

National Council of Student Young Men's Christian Association, 1926

Resolved, That we, the members of the 1926 National Council of Student Young Men's Christian Association, do hereby register our emphatic protest against compulsory military training—in other than technically military schools—as one of these agencies of militarism in our schools, colleges, and universities.

International Convention of the Disciples of Christ, October, 1930

We deplore the expansion of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps in high schools and colleges of our country, and particularly its compulsory features. We agree with educators of high authority that if the course of instruction given is military training, it ought not to be given to pupils of high-school age; if it is not military training, it ought not to be a War Department expenditure.

Central Conference of Jewish Rabbis, 1928

We reaffirm our opposition to the militarization of our schools and colleges by compulsory military training.

World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches. Adopted at the annual meeting, St. Louis, 1927. Readopted at the annual meeting, New York, 1928

Without raising the question of the expediency of maintaining an adequate military and naval defense so long as the war system lasts, we deplore any tendencies which put undue emphasis on militarism in education. In particular, we oppose military training in all public and high schools and all compulsory military training in colleges and universities, except in institutions established for the specific purpose of military education.

National Study Conference on the Churches and World Peace, February, 1930—Military training

1. We agree with former Secretary of State Kellogg that "the most certain insurance" against war "is the training of the thoughts of men in the way of peace," and we deplore the present Federal expenditure for military training in high schools, civil colleges, and summer camps—an expenditure which is greater than the total operating costs of the Department of State.

2. Accepting the expert opinion of the World Federation of Education Associations, the National Education Association, and other competent bodies that military training is not the best form of training for developing physique, citizenship, and patriotism, we urge that the citizens' military training camps should be reorganized and renamed without the military element, but with emphasis upon physical development and nonmilitary ways of national service, such as projects of reclamation and conservation of natural resources, and that the control of these camps and expenditures for the same should be lodged in the Department of the Interior or some other civilian agency, and not in the Department of War.

3. With regard to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, we call the attention of the churches to the particular dangers of military compulsion, military propaganda, and military money inhering in War Department control of this military education in civil universities and schools. We urge the churches throughout the country to gather fact material in local communities and States and study intensively the psychological effects of military courses, especially their effect on the attitudes of students toward such questions as preparedness, the World Court, 100 per cent nationalism, freedom of speech and discussion, etc. We also urge that wherever compulsory military training exists our churches shall spread the facts concerning it so as to facilitate speedy abolition of the same. We recommend cooperation with the committee on militarism in education, Bible House, Astor Place, New York, and other peace agencies studying this subject. Especially in high schools and church schools and colleges we believe that military training is out of place and that there should be no compulsory military courses in any civil institution of higher learning. To this extent, at least, the national defense act should be revised and amended so that our Government, which has signed the pact of Paris renouncing war as an instrument of national policy, will no longer aid in coercing schoolboys to prepare for battle.

THE ATTITUDES OF EDUCATIONAL BODIES

The American Physical Education Association, at an annual convention during the war, at which "preparedness" was the leading topic, resolved:

That military drill in the public schools does not develop the necessary qualities in youth which prepare a nation for the struggles of war, to say nothing of those of peace, because—

(a) It is not only very limited in its activities but actually harmful in its effects on boys less than 18 or 20 years of age, as has been so clearly demonstrated by Sir William Aitkin, professor of pathology in the Army Medical School of England.

(b) It can not teach the boys the real art of war, since they are too young to handle the real weapons and undergo the rigors of adequate instruction.

(c) It fosters a false sense of patriotism which does not appreciate the seriousness of war or the glories of peace.

(d) Constant drill in a hall or on an athletic field is artificial, monotonous, and wearisome, tending to produce an aversion for military training instead of an interest in the real problems of a soldier.

4. That a rational system of physical training, consisting of exercises and games adapted to the age, sex, and capacity of the growing boy and girl, as well as instruction in hygiene, sanitation, and first aid, is of the greatest value in preparing the youth of the country for the struggles of war and of peace. * * *

The National Education Association, department of superintendence, after careful study of the values of military training in the schools, resolved during the war:

* * * It is often claimed that military exercises, whether we call them military training or military drill, offer the best method of training pupils in obedience, promptness, truthfulness, industry, and other desirable personal traits; in short, of developing personal character and of training pupils physically. Those engaged in the work of education are practically unanimous in asserting that these claims have no justification.

* * * The ideals of the kind of obedience and of general conduct aimed at by military exercises are best represented by the word "martinet," which these exercises long ago contributed to our educational vocabulary—ideals which every teacher who aims at real character development seeks to avoid.

Those who favor military drill maintain that it is the most effective means of developing patriotic feeling. If this theory were well founded, we should all be eager to adopt it, for, as teachers of the young, we acknowledge the responsibility which regard for the patriotic citizenship of our children places upon us, and agree that we must be unceasing in our efforts to plant the virtue of patriotism in their hearts. But if we look beneath the surface, we find that military patriotism may be no deeper and no more lasting than military obedience. We must not confuse excitement with patriotism, the showy exhibition with real love of country. * * * But we go further. We must teach our pupils to make the passage from love of country to love of mankind, love of humanity, a transition which civilization teaches us to make, but which the spirit of military drill can not make, but rather tends to prevent.

The World Federation of Education Associations, August, 1929

Resolved, (1) That an endeavor be made to secure that systematic military training shall not be given in civil education institutions, but where such institutions undertake military training it shall in no case be a compulsory subject of the curriculum.

(2) That every endeavor be made to secure the substitution of physical training, of exercise, and of sports for the military training too often now given in civil education institutions and so to insure adequate training in character and citizenship and thus to lead the youth of the world to a better and wider appreciation of the real meaning of patriotism and the duties of citizenship.

American Federation of Teachers, 1929

Whereas efforts are being made by the War Department to establish Reserve Officers' Training Corps units in the public high schools of the country; and

Whereas in these efforts to attract young men to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, the War Department uses pretty girls, credits, uniforms, saddle horses, etc., as bait; and

Whereas the establishment of Reserve Officers' Training Corps units in the high schools will put the public school system of the country under the control of the War Department, create a war mind set with a psychological situation favorable to war or its outbreak; and

Whereas the training received in the units is a very inadequate substitute for physical training or training in citizenship since the Reserve Officers' Training Corps training stresses unquestioned obedience, whereas training for citizenship depends for its effectiveness on the development of a critical and questioning attitude; therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Federation of Teachers oppose not only the establishment of Reserve Officers' Training Corps units in our high schools but also any attempt to militarize the mind of America.

American Federation of Teachers, 1930

Whereas compulsory military training is inconsistent with the spirit of democratic education, and

Whereas the Attorney General of the United States has interpreted the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862 as requiring only that military training be offered by the State institutions which come under its provisions, not that such training be compulsory on every male student, and

Whereas the State legislature of Wisconsin in 1923 explicitly removed the compulsory feature from its statute regulating military training in the university of that State, and

Whereas there are 86 colleges and universities in the United States where military training is compulsory for at least two years, many of which come under the Morrill Act, be it

Resolved, That the American Federation of Teachers urge its members to cooperate with those groups in their own States which are working through universities and legislatures to remove the compulsory provision wherever found.

National Congress of Parents and Teachers, June, 1920

The National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teacher Associations places itself on record as opposed to compulsory military training and service. * * *

* * * We urge the passage of the bill for universal physical education as part of the school system, thereby giving equal opportunity to girls and boys for physical development and making unnecessary the effort for compulsory military training.

National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teacher Associations, 1923

Whereas the Department of War has frankly avowed its purpose of entering our schools in order to secure a larger number of summer military camps and has already launched this program: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teacher Associations protest this attempt to foster the military spirit.

Camp Fire Girls, Executive and Guardians Association, January, 1922

Whereas the camp-fire idea does not harmonize with the formality of military drills and terms; and

Whereas it has been proved in camps of Camp Fire Girls that better response to the Camp Fire program is gained by substituting the organized hike and the organized game for formal drill and by using the usual terms of everyday life to express leadership in place of military terminology: Be it

Resolved, That all guardians, executives, and directors of Camp Fire Girls discourage the use of anything military in their group or camp organization.

ATTITUDES OF LABOR AND FARMER GROUPS

American Federation of Labor, 1927

The committee recommends continued support of proposed legislation to prohibit compulsory military training in any educational institution.

Illinois State Federation of Labor, Herrin, Ill., November, 1928

Resolved, That while the Illinois Federation of Labor is not opposed to providing military instruction in the university for those college students who wish it, it does oppose making this training obligatory upon those who do not wish to take such training. It therefore instructs its officers to work for the removal of the compulsory feature and for the substitution of adequate physical training and instruction in citizenship for those students who do not elect the military work.

Farmer-Labor Party, July, 1923

Whereas there is an extensive, heavily financed, and steadily increasing propaganda in this country, directed by the War Department, to militarize the United States by standardizing the children in the schools, by shrewd methods inducing and in some cases even compelling the youth of the land into entering military organizations, and by wholesale attack upon citizens' organizations working in the interests of peace; therefore be it

Resolved, That we offset the attempt to militarize the minds of our children by demanding the teaching of the truth about the causes, results, and character of war, and the teaching of the history of the efforts of men to achieve world peace, in our schools, and the elimination of material tending to the glorification of war and the perpetuation of hereditary hatreds from our textbooks.

The National Grange, Seattle, November, 1928

Whereas the teaching of military training in our high schools, colleges, and universities is not in keeping with the spirit that actuates the almost universal effort to secure world-wide peace; therefore be it

Resolved, That we favor the elimination of military training from high schools and the compulsory feature from colleges and universities.

National Farmers' Union Convention, Denver, Colo., November 23, 1928

1. We are in favor of every move toward the abolition of war as a means of settlement of differences between nations. We therefore urge the ratification of the Kellogg treaties, the lessening of emphasis of military training in high schools and colleges, and the complete abandonment of the principle of compulsory military training in any public school. We would point out in this connection in the case of land and agricultural colleges the distinction between the compulsory offering of a military course and the compulsory participation in such a course on the part of the student body.

ATTITUDES OF WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS

National Council of Jewish Women, 1926

Whereas compulsory military training in schools and colleges of the United States has greatly increased since the World War; and

Whereas such training stresses war psychology in the minds of our youth; and

Whereas the War Department is thus given unprecedented influence in our civil educational institutions; and

Whereas such training runs counter to the movement to substitute law for war: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the National Council of Jewish Women, in triennial assembled, do earnestly urge that the compulsory feature of such training be eliminated in land-grant colleges.

National Council of Jewish Women, 1929

Whereas military training in secondary schools of the United States has greatly increased since the World War; and

Whereas such training tends to stress war psychology in the minds of our adolescents; and

Whereas the War Department is given unprecedented influence in our civil educational institutions; and

Whereas such training runs counter to the movement to substitute law for war: Be it

Resolved, That we adopt the recommendation that the further introduction of such training be eliminated in the secondary schools.

Federation of Women's Board of Foreign Missions of North America convention, Atlantic City, N. J., January 9–12, 1926

Permanent world peace can never be achieved until the children of the world are trained to believe in it and strive for it * * * We therefore recommend that this organization protest against the militarization of youth in our church and schools, and by every means assist in raising a generation around the world which will "learn war no more," but will learn realization of justice, love, and mutual respect as a basis for a new world order.

National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, Cleveland, Ohio, January, 1927

* * * The Sisterhoods' recommendation is that the compulsory feature of military training be eliminated in all land-grant colleges.

National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, November, 1922

We urge the continued cooperation of the United States in world affairs, responsible membership in effective world organization for peace, outlawry of war by international law, and world reduction of armaments to police force. We oppose military training in our schools.

ATTITUDES OF LABOR AND FARMER GROUPS

New York State Federation of Labor, 1929

Whereas (the New York State Federation of Labor) feels that the established institutions for military training by the War Department, both State and National, are sufficient for the training of citizens for defensive purposes without the introduction of military training into the public schools * * * (we) are opposed to establishing of the units of the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps in any branch of the public-school system.

National Women's Trade Union League, 1926 and 1929

The committee desires to emphasize the importance of peace, working among children and young people through the schools, and protests against compulsory military training in our public schools and colleges.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is not a question of compulsory military training. This is a question of whether the Congress of the United States is going to attempt to run the business of every school and college in the land, or whether we are going to leave it to the boards of trustees of those schools and colleges.

Under the national defense act this training is provided for those schools which elect it and in such manner as the boards of trustees and school commissioners of the different towns decide it should be run. Do you suppose for a

minute that if there was any substantial objection in any school or college to military training that any board of trustees would permit it to go on? Do you suppose that if that objection existed in the city of Washington, in the city of Philadelphia, or in any other city in the land, the board of education of such city would permit compulsory military training to go on?

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Within the last 10 minutes my attention has been called to the fact that at the University of Minnesota eight years ago the student body signed a petition to the extent of 4,000 protesting against this training, and the authorities of that institution dismissed from its rolls hundreds of those students because they would not conform to the requirements.

Mr. TABER. And we should not attempt to tell the University of Minnesota how to run its business. That is ridiculous. A statement was made in the hearings before the Military Appropriations Committee by the secretary of one of these pacifist organizations, one of these organizations which exist for the purpose of maintaining a paid secretary. He told us that the California Institute of Technology applied to the War Department and they found that they would not get the service unless they continued to have it compulsory. You turn to the list of those institutions that are receiving this service and you do not find that institution anywhere on the list.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. BARBOUR. The California Institute of Technology does not appear on this list at all?

Mr. TABER. Not at all, which bears out the fact that that institution never had this service. It is the most ridiculous thing for us to attempt to tell every institution in the land how they shall run their business. [Applause.] The worst thing you can do for education is to take it away from the parents and guardians of the children and take it into the Congress of the United States and take it away from the trustees of the universities throughout the land and attempt to handle the proposition from Washington.

It seems to me this amendment should be defeated and that the law should be allowed to go on so that the youth of the land may be permitted to continue this training in an orderly way, under the direction of those who run the schools. [Applause.]

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen of the committee, I do not believe anybody would accuse me of being a pacifist. If I may be open to any accusation it is being for too much national defense. Therefore to-day I rise, not as a pacifist but as an American citizen and Member of Congress, to favor the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA]. [Applause.]

I have listened to this debate and some very interesting facts have been brought out, but there are a few things which I think should be cleared up. For instance, the chairman in reading a list of these different institutions gave the impression that a school like Norwich University in the State of Vermont, which is a military school, would not come under Mr. LAGUARDIA'S amendment. Mr. LAGUARDIA'S amendment provides that any school which is a recognized military school of the United States shall be excluded from his amendment.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. BARBOUR. Is Norwich University a military school?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes; it is. The students wear uniforms and it is one of the best military schools in the country.

Mr. BARBOUR. The vice president of the university is present and maybe he can tell us.

Mr. GIBSON. It is strictly a military school.

Mr. CONNERY. Yes; it is strictly a military school. Also I would like to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to this fact, which is a little personal affair which happened to me just before Christmas. I am not in favor of compulsory military training except in time of war. I believe every instinct of the American people is against compulsory military training [applause], and I am not talking as a pacifist.

I went down to see the Secretary of War last week with Father MacDonald, of the city of Lawrence, who has a corps of cadets up there called St. Mary's Cadets. It is not a military school and is purely a voluntary affair. These boys, 800 of them, come in and drill two nights or three nights a week, and in the World War they had 95 per cent voluntary enlistment in the service of the United States. [Applause.] We went to the Secretary of War in an endeavor on the part of Father MacDonald to purchase—not to get them free—but to purchase enough uniforms for these boys, and we found that under the present law he could not buy them. He could not get obsolete uniforms, he could not get surplus uniforms for these boys who are purely patriotic and unselfish in the service of their country, because there would have to be an auction and some clothing dealer in the army and navy stores could buy $150,000 worth, but of course Father MacDonald with his group of 800 boys could not afford to come in and buy $150,000 worth of uniforms in order to outfit 800 boys.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BARBOUR. I am in sympathy with the gentleman, but this amendment would not alter that situation. We would have to change the law itself.

Mr. CONNERY. I understand that, but I am stating that if the committee would take care of the boys of the United States who are willing, not by compulsion but voluntarily, to give their services to the United States, by at least giving them uniforms so they may be able to parade and drill, we would get better results than by compulsory military training.

Mr. BARBOUR. The gentleman would have to change the authorizing act in order to do that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The Committee on Appropriations could not do that.

Mr. BARBOUR. I am in sympathy with the proposition of the gentleman and would like to see that done.

Mr. CONNERY. I am calling this to the attention of the gentleman in contradistinction to the requirement of compulsory military training.

Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELSH] stated it very tritely and expertly when he stated that the high school and the military college training of the men in the World War did not mean a thing as far as military training is concerned, and even the members of your Regular Army and National Guard, when they got in the trenches had to be "untaught" a number of things they had learned. It was an entirely new type of warfare to them because you did not have hand grenades in the early wars. You did not have 1-pounders or gas masks in the Spanish-American War, or a thousand and one other things that were used in the World War.

Now, take the case of a boy 14 or 15 years old who has tuberculosis. You may send him to the University of Maine, or any other school with compulsory military training. He goes to the University of Maine, not because he wants to be a soldier, but because he wants to learn Latin or Greek or engineering, or whatever subject he is interested in.

After you put him there he may be taken out on an 18-mile hike when any doctor in the world will tell you that you should not take a man who is afflicted with TB or who is not physically able to go on hikes, and make him hike for 18 miles, and yet they do it with these men. I know they do it, Mr. Chairman. What they should do with these men is to put them in a gymnasium and let them use the dumb-bells or let them use the pulleys or the punching bag or something moderate that is suitable to men in that condition, and not compulsory drilling or hikes.

Mr. BARBOUR and Mr. MAAS rose.

Mr. CONNERY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BARBOUR. With respect to the incident the gentleman has just referred to, the national defense act specifi-

cally states that this training shall be given to young men who are physically fit.

Mr. CONNERY. That is what the act may state, but practically what happens is that whether it is in a high school or in a college, when they call out the battalion for drill, you go, and if you do not go they say, "Oh, you are yellow."

Mr. BARBOUR. But the gentleman will admit that those who are not physically fit do not have to take such training. I know that is true of all of these institutions.

Mr. CONNERY. Theoretically yes; practically no. It is like it was in the Army, where you were supposed to be always well, and if you went on sick report some hard-boiled officer would say that you were yellow. You might be almost dead but that did not matter.

Mr. MAAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. MAAS. Can the gentleman cite a specific case where they even permit them to take such drills if they are not physically fit? As a matter of fact, they are not allowed to take it if they are not physically fit.

Mr. CONNERY. I have not had that experience. If the gentleman has had that experience, then his experience is different from mine.

Mr. MAAS. I will ask the gentleman to cite a single case where anybody who was unfit had to submit to military training.

Mr. CONNERY. Does the gentleman want me to get statistics and give him the names of the boys who were not physically fit who were called out for drill and the institutions that they attended?

Mr. MAAS. It is not of much value to Congress unless the gentleman can do that.

Mr. CONNERY. Does the gentleman want me to give a list of such boys who were made to drill every day in the high schools when they were not physically fit?

Mr. MAAS. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. Very well; I will give the gentleman a list of the names and addresses of the boys who were taken out on hikes when they were not physically fit.

I do not believe that the American people want compulsory training. When it comes time to go to war, I believe the American people are in favor of the draft to take them, rich and poor, regardless of where they come from.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two more minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I will not take any further time except to say that I am in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from New York and I do not agree with some of the remarks that have been made quoting certain pacifist organizations in favor of this amendment. I am not a pacifist. I have no sympathy with pacifist doctrines. I have fought for national defense every minute since I have been a Member of this House during the past eight years.

From my point of view this is not a pacifist proposition. It is a question of whether a boy up in the State of Maine, for instance, wants to go to the University of Maine and get an education and will be compelled to go to school in New Hampshire, Vermont, or Massachusetts unless he agrees to take compulsory training or whether he will be a free-born American citizen, to receive his education where he wants to get it, ready and willing, if necessary, in time of war to take up arms in the defense of his country. [Applause.]

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS. I suggest that the gentleman make it 30 minutes.

Mr. BARBOUR. Very well, I will accept that.

Mr. COLLINS. And out of that I want 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ARENTZ). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I understood the motion of the gentleman from California that the time be equally divided between those for and against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not so understand, but the Chair will recognize those for and against.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I think the question before the House is not a question of compulsory training at all, but is a question whether you are going to have Congress run these institutions. Compulsory military training is no different than the requirement to learn a foreign language. It might be objectionable to some Members of the House that these boys should learn a foreign language. Would you withhold an appropriation for the school because they did not like that course?

Now, the situation at the University of Minnesota has been misrepresented. However, it does not make any difference whether every student signed the petition; are we going to have the colleges or schools run by students or by the boards of trustees? Besides, there never were three or four hundred students dismissed because they refused to take the compulsory military training.

Mr. HUDSON. Is that school for the students or is it for the faculty?

Mr. MAAS. Do you want the soviet or communistic element to run this college? Would you set up soviets of students to dictate the courses they should take? And how about the insane asylums—who are they for? [Laughter.] Do you want the inmates to run them? [Laughter.]

Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman consider that analogous?

Mr. HUDSON. The gentleman ought to know the difference between an insane asylum and a university.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I insist that the Chair protect the gentleman from Minnesota. [Laughter.]

Mr. MAAS. Thanks, but I do not need protection. [Laughter.] I know that I will be called a militarist because I am opposing this amendment, but that does not bother me. That is always the way with these pacifists; if anyone opposes their proposition, then they are militarists. How many of these men went through the last war? Some did. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] did. But most of them know nothing of the actual problem of training. We had a horrible loss, a terrific loss, of human life because we were not prepared. These men who went through the war are asking for adequate defense. Everybody else was prepared, and that was why we suffered that great loss of human life. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELSH] says that there is no benefit and no value in this military training. That is not true. Our best officers and noncommissioned officers came from the schools where we had military training. They say that the whole theory of our position seems to be that these schools where they have military training is an insidious device to bring up students as militarists. That is a lot of bunk and you gentlemen know it. I defy you to mention a single instance where they have taught militarism or inculcated a military spirit.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Germany went through intensive military training, and where is she now?

Mr. MAAS. And so did every other nation in the world except the United States, and we had the most horrible loss of life of any of them.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Oh, no.

Mr. MAAS. The gentleman says that being trained did not keep Germany out of war. Our being unprepared did not keep us out of the war.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. No; but it put Germany into it, and us also.

Mr. MAAS. One more thought I want to get before this House. I have been making an independent study in the last year or so, and I want the Members of this House to know that the delinquency records of the country show a most surprising condition with respect to boys who have had military training. The number of boys who have had military training who get into difficulty with the law and with police officers is about one-fifth of those who have not had military training and who do get into such difficulties. [Applause.]

We are in the position, on the one hand, of saying to the schools that we want these boys given military training, and "here is the money to train them with," but on the other hand, of saying that "if you compel them to take the training, you can not have the money to train them." The military side of this training is, however, the smallest part of the benefit. It is the benefit to the boys of systematic, regular exercise, discipline, inculcating habits of neatness, orderliness, courtesy, and the democratic ideals of common service, where all men of given rank are treated equally, regardless of family name, wealth, or social position, that really counts. The uniform becomes the democratizing agent and quickly eliminates snobbishness. A large part of these so-called military courses in our schools is devoted to instilling, not a desire for war, but a deep, abiding peace-time citizenship of the finest kind.

It is not militarism to teach the youth of the country to be prepared to defend their country if the need should arise. That is what is taught and that is all that is taught of a military nature. There is never even the hint of training for any other purpose. If it is a crime to be taught that it is right to defend your country, then thank God there are a lot of us yet who are willing to be such criminals. But a pretty state of affairs has come to pass if it is a crime to teach patriotism. If we are, however, to teach that it is right and decent and proper to defend one's country when defense is needed, then we must provide the means of teaching the youth how to defend it if their services ever become necessary. It is getting now so that one must blush to even mention patriotism.

In most States there are laws requiring boys and girls up to certain ages to go to school. Most of the subjects are specified, and yet there is no protest about compelling these students to take some course that they may not want to take. The principle is the same. Congress would not think of interfering with an individual State and say that the State had no right to compel its youth to go to school if the schools in that State required instruction in American history, let us say. Who among you would stand for Congress fixing the speed laws within the various States on any Federal-aid highway, just because Congress contributed a part of the money to build the highways?

What right has Congress to tell the Legislature of Minnesota what it shall or shall not require to be taught at the University of Minnesota? I deny that Congress has any such right. It is a matter for the people of Minnesota to decide. We elect our legislature, and if we do not want compulsory military training in our schools in Minnesota, we, the people of Minnesota, have the remedy in our hands. Our legislature will act in that matter for us, not this Congress. What right has a Congressman from Mississippi, or Michigan, or New York, to say what we in Minnesota shall permit at our educational institutions, any more than he would have to say what our traffic or speed laws are to be on our highways in Minnesota? This is not a matter of militarism; it is a matter of permitting the States to govern their own institutions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman and gentleman of the committee, I want you to think what will be the effect within our own States. I am opposed to compulsory military training as much as anybody on this floor, and some of you gentlemen here who know this to be the fact; some of you know my positive attitude during all of these years. But I am also a State rights man, and if South Carolina wants to have military training in her schools, I am opposed to denying her a fair access to the Treasury of the United States because she has some convictions about whether or not she wants military training in one or more of her schools. [Applause.]

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McSWAIN. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Is there any question of State rights involved in this?

Mr. McSWAIN. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The money comes out of the United States Treasury and is subject to the exclusive control of Congress and the War Department. How then is it a State rights question?

Mr. McSWAIN. Because a State that may be denied the right to participate in this fund has itself contributed money to that Federal fund, and that is where it comes in. Take the people of North Carolina that pays a million dollars a day into the Treasury of the United States. Do you say to her that her Agricultural and Mechanical College can not have one cent of this money unless they leave it optional with every Tom, Dick, and Harry when he comes in there as a freshman as to whether or not he will get up in the morning when the bugle blows? That is all it means. Let me tell you what is going to happen in South Carolina and every other State. In 1890, under the influence of the great Senator Tillman, the State of South Carolina set up the Clemson Agricultural and Mechanical College. You say that this is not a blow to the "essentially military" school. What is an "essentially military" school? Who is going to decide that question? There is no school that teaches nothing but military tactics and science. Military tactics and science is less than 10 per cent of what is taught by the most extreme military school in the country. It is less than 10 per cent of what is taught at West Point. The liberal arts and sciences are taught more than 90 per cent. West Point, according to that definition, would not be an essentially military school.

Under Governor Tillman we set up the Clemson Agricultural and Mechanical College. This amendment is aimed at land-grant colleges and at State universities. Make no mistake. It will cripple them.

Mr. REED of New York rose.

Mr. McSWAIN. Just a moment. When we in South Carolina set up that Clemson College we built our barracks, and we built it on the theory and assumption that it would be a strictly military school. Now, you say to us that we can not come in and get one cent of this fund unless we say to the boys in these barracks, "You can have your choice as to whether or not you will have the training." That means this: There are four boys in one room. The bugle blows in the morning. Three of them lie back and say, "I'll be durned if I'm going to get up for that bugle"; but the other one says, "Well, in order to get that $107 a year that my daddy can not pay, if I am to stay in this college, I will crawl out of this good, warm bed and attend that formation."

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McSWAIN. No; excuse me, I want to finish this statement. We heard the gentleman make an eloquent argument, and it was a good one, as he usually makes. There are in South Carolina at least 500 young men in the Clemson College who would not be there to-day but for this fund. Why? Because they are paying not only for their uniform but paying cash for their training so that

they can use it to help pay their board, and I know of my own knowledge dozens and dozens of boys whose fathers under the present price of cotton could not keep them in the college but for the aid they receive from this fund. If there are 500 in South Carolina, I suspect there are probably 5,000 in some other big States, and perhaps 1,000 in Michigan, and perhaps 1,000 in Kansas; and some of your neighbors' boys are going to be turned out of school next fall if this amendment should be adopted. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman has not quite covered all of the ground.

Mr. McSWAIN. Then I ask my brother to help me cover it. It would take hours to tell the whole truth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] merely provides for elective military training in the colleges and schools of the country, except at the essentially military schools. During the last year we had 131,038 enrolled in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

We had 15,544 in 55–C work. That is another branch of training in the schools. We had 2,300 in that branch below 55–C school work, making a total of 148,277 boys in the schools of the country taking various kinds of military training. They are given these courses for the purpose of helping, or at least we thought so, along the lines of military defense, so that we could make officers out of them; not privates, but officers. Out of all that number we got 6,514 reserve officers—only 6,514—and of those not more than half will be officers a few months from now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the gentleman want to know the reason?

Mr. COLLINS. I do not wish to yield just now. This shows that this particular work is worthless from the standpoint of military defense. Now, with regard to that particular work, I favor this amendment because it will create a situation where a boy can take the training if he wants to, and if it meets with the approval of his parents, but where no boy in a civil school will be drafted against his will. I do not like the present practice which forces practically every boy in the United States who desires to take a course in agriculture to take it with a course in military training. That is the situation to-day.

Mr. BEEDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. I yield.

Mr. BEEDY. There has been a good deal said about this Congress taking away from local communities the right to set up their own educational systems. Does the gentleman not think it is just as valuable for us to guard the rights and freedom of choice in the youth of 18 years throughout the country as it is to look after the boards of trustees? [Applause.]

Mr. COLLINS. I certainly do. Now, that is the situation with reference to the farmer boys of this country. It is almost 100 per cent true with reference to courses in mechanics also.

Now, the attitude of the War Department is not only to put this training in the institutions but they require that an institution compel a boy who once enrolls in a military course to complete that course before he can be graduated in his academic subjects. Under the existing circumstances a boy could make a grade of 100 per cent in every school subject and be denied his diploma just because he failed in military drill. That is a deplorable situation for this country of ours.

Let us examine further the attitude of the War Department. Testimony before our committee showed that a school out in California was not permitted by the War Department to change from compulsory to elective training. Last year they were listed in the War Department figures given our committee as having compulsory training. This year they have none. The department dropped them entirely when they tried to make drill elective.

Also notice the attitude of the Chief of Staff of the United States Army on this question. He ought to represent the official attitude. General Summerall said in his final report:

> The most serious danger to the continued prosperity of the Reserve Officers Training Corps that has arisen in recent years lies in the effect of the decision of the Secretary of the Interior, sustained by the opinion of the Attorney General, that military training is not compulsory in land-grant colleges under the Morrill Act.

You see, the Chief of Staff of the United States Army favors the compulsory idea. Who can deny that that is the attitude of the Army?

Now let us go along a little further. This Congress is concerned with providing our country with military security. You can provide military security in only one way, and that is by providing our Army with modern fighting implements. These modern fighting implements, such as machine guns, the Christie tank that is out at the east door of the Capitol now, airplanes, and gas, cost money. If you provide these modern fighting implements, you will have to cut down your military personnel, because you can not have both.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COLLINS. Please let me finish.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We will save time.

Mr. COLLINS. No; it will not save time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I would like to show why——

Mr. COLLINS. I can not yield to the gentleman just now. I am sorry.

You can not have both. You can not have modern fighting implements and great armies of men, too. That tank out there can destroy every Reserve Officers' Training Corps unit in the country. How could boys perform fours right and fours left in the face of such hellish instrument of war as that? To attain a modern fighting force we must use modern fighting implements, and we can not do that within the limits of present appropriations. We must cut down our personnel in order to do it. Those of you who think you are militarists, who worship at the shrine of some captain or major or colonel, making daily reports to him on how you have acted in order to make his lot in life better, I want to say to that particular class that when you oppose such an amendment as this you are not working for military defense; you are working against military defense. You are not as military minded as you think you are; you are pacifists in sheep's clothing subtly undermining military security.

Captain Hart, the greatest military writer of this particular day, emphasizes the necessity of four instruments of warfare—the machine gun, gas, tanks, and airplanes.

He said that an army ought to be built around those four instrumentalities of warfare and that we ought to cut down the use of khaki. In other words, do not subject our boys to the folly of trying to fight the next war with man power, when machines will ruthlessly crush men. And if you train these boys in these obsolete methods you are worse off than if you had no training.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder how my friend from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] can believe that tanks and other war implements would be effective in the way of defense unless we have trained men to man them. [Applause.]

In the State of Florida we have a land-grant college. Twenty years ago, when I first entered that institution, there were approximately 200 students. To-day they have 2,200 or 2,300, for the simple reason that young men select it. They prefer to go to this institution, which is a military

institution. Military training there, of course, is not exacted of men who are not physically qualified for same. They have competent physicians to pass on the physical fitness of all young men—under 21 years of age—before they are required to drill.

That institution has grown also in efficiency, prestige, and general standing in proportion with and in keeping with its attendance growth. It is to-day one of the Nation's leading institutions of higher learning, drawing its student body from almost every State in the Union and from many foreign countries. Dr. John J. Tigert, former United States Commissioner of Education, is president of the University of Florida, and according to advice from him believes that Federal funds should continue for the land-grant colleges and that military training should be carried on in same.

Extensive military training is not given in these schools, but enough is had to teach the students necessary discipline, the importance of organized action, leadership, and punctuality. Their general health and incident mental efficiency is benefited. Our university, with its splendid faculty and great student body, is the pride of the entire State of Florida, and, in fact, its athletic teams, debating teams, and other student organizations have received most honorable mention, distinction, and recognition in many other States. It is furnishing trained, competent, and dependable leaders.

A large number of worthy students who are in financial need are receiving small financial benefits from the Federal funds. Without same many of them would be compelled to leave the university.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the LaGuardia amendment. It is against the best interests of our institutions of higher learning. Furthermore, it would restrict Federal money in such a manner as to give Federal interference with State education. I do not want Federal officials to tell my State's instructors to teach or not to teach certain subjects. The Florida State Board of Control and the faculty of the University of Florida are capable of deciding upon courses to be taught in our State's institutions; we do not want Federal restriction. If Florida wants military training in her university, let her have it; she is fully capable of guiding her own destiny in this respect.

A more capable or honorable board of control never served Florida than her present board. The board members are unselfish and patriotic. I gladly trust Florida's institutions of higher learning to their custody and care. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, for a long time I have paid attention to the subject of preparedness by the United States, and I notice that this debate quickly runs to that question. I was a Member of Congress in the years that approached the World War, and a Member of the Congress that declared war and then had to do many things crudely, hastily, and improperly because of unpreparedness. I was a Member also of the Congress that had to do with the building up and passage of the national defense act. That act was built up through much labor, and as a result of much painful experience on the part of the United States. That was in 1920, and from that day to this, through various sources, some of which we know, I have seen and you have seen the national defense act being stripped—weakened, cut down inch by inch. Look out. One does not have to be a militarist, but every one should be for the full sovereignty of the United States, and for all proper defense. I would not impugn the motives of any person nor would I even dare to call that valiant and militant fighter LAGUARDIA a pacifist, but I beg to call attention to the fact that his amendment, cleverly written so that it can pass muster as a germane amendment, is not really an amendment which should be considered in connection with the passage of an appropriation bill. If the Members of the House desire to discuss a matter of this kind, let a bill come before the House under a rule so that the whole membership may give full consideration to it. [Applause.] Do not write the proposal as a restriction on an appropriation bill.

What the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] has said about the need for ammunition and machinery is true enough, but, my friends, many of the same influences which are working in this particular instance, endeavor to hamper us there and make it increasingly difficult to get airplanes, men, and everything else we need for the protection of our sovereignty. The United States is a Nation with 123,000,000 people and with an Army of only about 118,000 officers and men. Is that anything to be afraid of? [Applause.] All the boys who can possibly be trained a little along military lines in these schools and universities will not make our Nation military-minded, and may help quite a bit in the general advance toward the order, the dignity and the feeling of security necessary in a great sovereign Nation. [Applause.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. May I inquire how the time stands for and against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. After the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. CLAGUE] has spoken there will be one minute remaining.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am asking how the time stands for and against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has divided the time as equally as he could do so.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I am informed that the gentleman from Minnesota will speak against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Minnesota speaks against the amendment, there will be one minute remaining to those who are for the amendment.

Mr. CLAGUE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, there has been a great deal said here pro and con as to whether or not agricultural land-grant colleges can decide for themselves as to whether this military course shall be elective or compulsory. It has been stated by the chairman of the committee and by others that that is true. I want to call the attention of the members of the committee to an opinion rendered by the Attorney General. That opinion was rendered June 20, 1930, on this very question. I will state that the Wisconsin University is a land-grant college and they have an elective course. In substance this is what the Attorney General held. His opinion is rather lengthy and I will ask unanimous consent to incorporate it in my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLAGUE. The substance of the opinion is this: He holds that land-grant colleges can decide for themselves and the course can be elective. In taking up this question he says:

> I therefore advise you that you are justified in considering that an agricultural college which offers a proper, substantial course in military tactics complies most efficiently with the requirements as to military tactics in the act of July 2, 1862, and the other acts above mentioned, even though the students of that institution are not compelled to take that course.

That was an opinion which bore directly on this question, and that opinion, as I say, was rendered June 20, 1930.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLAGUE. Yes.

Mr. REED of New York. That being true, there is an appropriation carried here for the commandants who are assigned from the Regular Army to each of these colleges, and the effect of this amendment would be to deprive them of their salaries and not permit this training to be given in the land-grant colleges.

Mr. CLAGUE. That is true.

Mr. STAFFORD. To a minor extent.

Mr. CLAGUE. The point I am making is this: We want to leave this up to the schools themselves. The agricultural college in the State of Minnesota is a land-grant college. Military training is now required, but the board of regents

of the Minnesota Agricultural College can make it elective if they so decide. The university regents of our State come from different districts in our State. They represent the people; they are a part of our own people, and if we decide we do not want military training it is up to our own people, so that each institution is left to determine this for itself.

Mr. COYLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLAGUE. Yes.

Mr. COYLE. I ask the gentleman to yield, in order that I may state that Doctor Richards, president of the Lehigh University, asks that the right to determine whether this training shall be compulsory or elective on the part of the students shall not be taken from the local authorities.

Mr. CLAGUE. The opinion of the Attorney General, referred to above, is as follows:

COURSES IN MILITARY TACTICS IN LAND-GRANT AGRICULTURAL COLLEGES

The Secretary of the Interior is justified in considering that an agricultural college which offers a proper, substantial course in military tactics complies sufficiently with the requirements as to military tactics in the act of July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503), and the amendatory acts, even though the students at that institution are not compelled to take that course.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
June 20, 1930.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 23, 1930, requesting my opinion as to whether agricultural colleges having grants under the act of July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503), and amendatory acts, are required to include military tactics among the compulsory courses of study, or whether they may simply offer this subject as an elective course.

The pertinent provision of the statute is contained in section 4, which reads as follows:

"And be it further enacted, that all moneys derived from the sale of the lands aforesaid by the States to which the lands are apportioned, and from the sales of land scrip hereinbefore provided for, shall be invested in stocks of the United States, or of the States, or some other safe stocks, yielding not less than 5 per cent upon the par value of said stocks; and that the moneys so invested shall constitute a perpetual fund, the capital of which shall remain forever undiminished (except so far as may be provided in section 5 of this act), and the interest of which shall be inviolably appropriated, by each State which may take and claim the benefit of this act, to the endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, in such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life."

Amendments of this section by the act of March 3, 1883 (ch. 102, 22 Stat. 484; U. S. C., title 7, sec. 304), and by the act of April 13, 1926 (ch. 130, 44 Stat. 247; U. S. C., Supp. III, title 7, sec. 304), reenacted the language printed in italics above without change.

By the act of August 30, 1890 (ch. 841, 26 Stat. 417), annual appropriation is made "for the more complete endowment and maintenance of colleges for the benefit of agriculture and mechanic arts now established, or which may be hereafter established in accordance with an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862 * * *." By section 4 of this act the Secretary of the Interior is charged with its administration, and he is directed to ascertain and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury annually as to each State and Territory whether it is entitled to receive its share of the annual appropriation. There is no requirement that the moneys appropriated under this act shall be devoted by the State to an institution then teaching military tactics, but only to an institution which had been or should be established under the act of July 2, 1862. The act of August 30, 1890, provides that the money shall "be applied only to instruction in agriculture, the mechanic arts, the English language, and the various branches of mathematical, physical, natural, and economic science, with special reference to their applications in the industries of life and to the facilities for such instruction * * *."

But by the act of March 4, 1907 (ch. 2907, 34 Stat. 1256, 1281), which appropriated additional money "for the more complete endowment and maintenance of agricultural colleges now established, or which may hereafter be established, in accordance with the act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and the act of Congress approved August 30, 1890, * * *" it is provided that the money so appropriated is "to be applied only for the purposes of the agricultural colleges as defined and limited in the act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and the act of Congress approved August 30, 1890." Another paragraph of this statute provides that the payment of the money appropriated shall be governed by the provisions of the act of 1890.

Under these statutes you and your predecessors have recognized the duty, so far as the appropriations made by the act of March 4, 1907, are concerned, to withhold a certificate as to any State which has not one or more colleges which are conducted in compliance with the provisions of the act of July 2, 1862. In determining whether such a certificate should be issued you are consequently confronted with the problem whether an institution, in order that it may comply with the act of July 2, 1862, must include military tactics as a compulsory course of study.

The statute nowhere specifically requires that the offered course in military tactics must be compulsory. My attention has been called to the fact that at the time when the original statute was passed in 1862 it appears that all or almost all courses offered in universities were compulsory, but, of course, this is not conclusive of the intention of Congress. The association of the word "military tactics" in the statute with the words "such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts" shows that there was no intention to require instruction in military tactics to be compulsory upon the student any more than those branches of learning related to agriculture and the mechanic arts. If one branch is compulsory all must be, and when we consider the great variety of branches which are related to agriculture and mechanic arts under the modern educational system, it is apparent that it would be impracticable to require any student to take all such courses. It is generally recognized that there is no obligation on agricultural colleges having land grants under the act of July 2, 1862, to compel their students to take any course related to agriculture or the mechanic arts. The use of the words "leading object" in the statute indicates that Congress must have intended to repose some discretion in the State or in the college to determine to what extent agriculture and the mechanic arts, scientific and classical studies, and military tactics should be taught or required. The additional provision of the statute that these branches of learning should be taught "in such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe" also suggests that it was the purpose of Congress to leave to the States a wide measure of control in the administration of the statute.

I have given consideration to the legislative history of the act of 1862. The manner in which the language in question came to be inserted in the bill does not convince me that Congress intended the course in military tactics to be compulsory. If it had had such an intention, it seems fair to assume that it would have expressed that intention in clear language. An examination of the report of the speech of Mr. Morrill, of Vermont (Cong. Globe, 37th Cong., 2d sess., pt. 4, Appendix, p. 256), who had charge of this bill in the House, reveals no clear statement to the effect that it was contemplated that military training would be compulsory on all students.

I have also considered what was done after the passage of the act of 1862. From a memorandum submitted to me, it appears that in several of the States, at least, courses in military tactics were compulsory in the years immediately following the passage of the act. But in a letter to the Secretary of War, under date of July 19, 1923, the Acting Secretary of the Interior informed the Secretary of War that "the policy of the Department of the Interior has been that a State fulfills its obligation under the law when it offers instruction and provides facilities for instruction in the branches of learning specified in the land-grant college legislation."

This ruling was published in 1925 by the Bureau of Education of your department in a bulletin entitled "Federal Laws and Ruling Affecting Land-Grant Colleges." I understand that this policy has been consistently followed, and that cases presenting the precise question under consideration have arisen. The problem has in particular been presented with respect to the State of Wisconsin since 1923, for in that year the legislature of that State provided by statute that the study of military training at the State university should be optional. (Wisconsin Laws, 1923, ch. 226.) It is significant that in 1926 Congress, in amending the act of July 2, 1862, reenacted the precise language of the act of July 2, 1862, italicized at the outset of this opinion. The Supreme Court has held in National Lead Co. *v.* U. S. (252 U. S. 140, 146–147) that the reenactment of a statute while an administrative interpretation of the statute is in effect "amounts to an implied legislative recognition and approval of the executive construction of the statute; * * * for Congress is presumed to have legislated with knowledge of such an established usage of an executive department of the Government. (U. S. *v.* Bailey, 9 Pet. 238, 256.)" To the same effect are U. S. *v.* Cerecedo Hermanos y Compania (209 U. S. 337, 339); U. S. *v.* Falk & Bro. (204 U. S. 143, 149).

I am of the opinion that the construction of the statute adopted by your department is a reasonable one, and it was in effect approved by Congress by the reenactment of the language in question after the adoption and publication of that construction by your department. Added force is given to the reenactment of this language by the fact that it occurred after the legislation in Wisconsin referred to above.

I therefore advise you that you are justified in considering that an agricultural college which offers a proper, substantial course in military tactics complies sufficiently with the requirement as to military tactics of the act of July 2, 1862, and the other acts above mentioned, even though the students at that institution are not compelled to take that course.

Respectfully,

WILLIAM D. MITCHELL.

To the SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the proposed amendment, there is but one question involved and that is whether the people of the respective States shall determine whether or not they want voluntary or compulsory military training in their schools.

The fact that this item is voted for commits the Congress to military training in the schools, does it not? This amendment, if adopted, would not reduce by one penny the money appropriated by Congress for military training in the schools. The fact that you will still allow to any student, if this amendment is adopted, $107, if that is the proper amount, who will accept military training, shows the Congress is putting a premium upon taking military training in the schools, does it not? All right, now, if you are going to vote for the item, the only remaining question, as I see it, is whether or not the judgment of the Congress or the judgment of the legislatures shall determine whether or not the people of the respective States shall or shall not have military training; and for one, I believe the people of my State and my legislature are just as capable of determining this question for the people of Texas as this Congress [applause], and it is none of your business. [Applause.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, no one urging State rights can properly stand in the face of this appropriation bill and the national defense act, because the national defense act took every vestige of State rights away from your National Guard and away from your military training. This training is being carried on in your State colleges with Federal money, with War Department officers, and you have not one word to say about it.

Now, let us be fair about it. That is all there is to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BARBOUR) there were—ayes 50, noes 162.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. On page 54, line 17, change the figures "451" to "455" in the citation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARBOUR: Page 54, line 17, strike out "451" and insert "455."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For arms, ammunition, targets, and other accessories for target practice, for issue and sale in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and approved by the Secretary of War, in connection with the encouragement of rifle practice, in pursuance of the provisions of law, $200,000.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LAGUARDIA). The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McSWAIN: Page 60, line 10, after the word "law," strike out "$200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$250,000."

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes in discussing this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for 10 minutes in order that I may explain that this amendment will involve, to a certain degree, a departure in policy, the beginning of a new régime in civilian rifle training, and I desire sufficient time, or at least some time, to seek to explain and justify such change.

The American Legion at its national convention in Boston in October, 1930, passed a resolution asking the Congress to continually increase its appropriations for this purpose until gradually there may be sufficient funds in the years to come to equip and accommodate one civilian rifle club for every American Legion post in the country.

Now, there are about 12,000 of these posts. At present there are about 116 posts that are desiring equipment in order to be organized and to commence their activities. There are at present in existence 1,600 such clubs.

I have a certain, definite belief that this is one of the very best ways and one of the most economical ways to achieve and to maintain a reasonable degree of preparedness. Several years ago I planned to establish a rifle range on one of my own little farms for the convenience of the citizens of the community and of the American Legion Post, but my plans were frustrated by reason of the fact that a gentleman came along and offered me about all that the land was worth. Now, I am glad I sold it, and I fear he is sorry he bought it. This is a mere incident explaining that years ago, before the American Legion acted, I realized the great importance of this plan upon a plan of wise preparedness of the individual citizens to function in time of war.

I agree with much that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] has said during the consideration of this bill with reference to the kind of arms that are most effective in time of war. Though I differ in certain fundamental principles from the gentleman of Mississippi, I think that the gentleman [Mr. COLLINS] has rendered a certain service in being persistent in his opposition to what might be called the anachronisms of the Military Establishment and insisting that they come up to date. I think that in a democracy a contrariety of ideas is always valuable and in the end conduces to wise decisions, but I submit that in addition to the four weapons that the gentleman mentioned as being indispensible in war—and they are—there is one weapon that is still highly indispensable and perhaps will be vital for generations to come, and that weapon is the individual rifle.

The man with the rifle is able to protect machine guns in advancing to position. The man with the rifle is thus able to help the machine gun function. The rifle can not do much to protect the airplane, but for these other weapons, as tanks and poisonous gas, the rifle is indisputably an auxiliary, and under some conditions of open warfare of movement is essential and indispensable.

In the next place the citizenry that knows how to use a rifle constitutes the most economical system for national defense. I submit, gentlemen, after a study on the ground of the Swiss Army on two different occasions, and after having read about it for many years, that the most economical, in proportion to its cost, the most efficient army now in the world or that ever has been in the world, is the Swiss Army.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McSWAIN. I will.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I understand in Switzerland it is the policy to train every able-bodied male and to encourage them in shooting?

Mr. McSWAIN. I was coming to that. In Switzerland there are over 4,000 civilian voluntary rifle clubs. Switzerland has a population of not quite 4,000,000. On that proportion there would be 120,000 rifle clubs in the United States. Now, the American Legion is only asking for one-twentieth of the number that exists in Switzerland to-day.

Now, what about the rifle? The Swiss for 17 years won the championship in 17 different matches. Every Swiss man from 21 to 48, every able-bodied man, must go upon the range every year and must make a passing grade, and if he does not, he has to go back and try it over.

Upon a Swiss holiday or Saturday afternoon upon the trains or trolleys going out of all the larger cities you will find civilian soldiers rushing from the factory, from the shop, or other work place with a rifle slung across his back, headed for the rifle range.

Now, what was the proof of the Swiss Army's efficiency during the World War? Germany was tempted to cross into Switzerland as well as over Belgium. Switzerland was nothing more to Germany than Belgium. But what hap-

pened? As soon as Germany began mobilizing her troops Switzerland mobilized an army of 200,000 men, and for four years Germany did not dare to cross the borders into Switzerland's territory. Why? Because when a Swiss rifleman fires there is going to be a dead man at the other end of the course of the bullet. Germany knew that. Other soldiers may raise the rifle, shut their eyes and shoot, and not do much damage, but when a Swiss soldier fires the result is a dead man. [Applause.] It takes practice to make a good rifle shot. In 1910 the Swiss population fired 10 shots for every man, woman, and child in Switzerland. But in Germany that same year—and Germany thought she was preparing to fight—in Germany they fired only one-half a shot for every man, woman, and child. In France it was the same; they fired only one-half a shot for every man, woman, and child. But in Switzerland they fired per capita twenty times as many shots as were fired in Germany or France.

Now, Switzerland is a liberty-loving country. It is the oldest republic in the world. For nearly 700 years they have been a free people. The Swiss believe in fighting for liberty and in fighting to maintain liberty, and I want to submit this thought, after some rather careful reading, that I believe that a fair investigation of the pages of history will show it to be true, that no people ever won or kept their liberty that were not able and willing to win it by force of arms. [Applause.]

No people will ultimately retain liberty unless they are willing and able to retain it by war. What we have to do is to draw the sharp line of demarcation between a policy of aggressive war and a policy of preparedness for defensive war. We in America must draw the line. That is what I think America has ever done, and nothing that I now see makes me apprehensive at all that America ever will become dangerously aggressive in the matter of war. But we must be on the alert. We must watch and resist any such tendency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. McSWAIN was granted leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

SWITZERLAND AS THE NURSERY OF PEACE

If there ever was a country where the people rule, it is Switzerland. If there ever was a people that are devoted to peace, it is the Swiss people. Practically all the international activities of the world have originated in Switzerland and now center around Switzerland. Such cooperative agencies as the International Postal Union and the International Telegraph Union are in Switzerland. In Geneva, Switzerland, was held the first international arbitration conference, being between the United States and Great Britain, concerning the claim for damages by the United States against Great Britain growing out of the raids upon American commerce by British raiders during the War between the States. An award was made against Great Britain and promptly paid. That was the first instance in history of two great nations voluntarily agreeing in the interest of peace to submit their claims to human arbitration.

In Switzerland originated the great Red Cross movement to alleviate the hardships and some of the horrors of war. Swiss authors and statesmen have been leaders in every movement to clarify and to codify international law, and thus to remove the cause for friction which so often brings on war. Upon Swiss territory, as on neutral ground, have been held practically all the conferences since the Paris Peace Conference, for setting up the framework of friendship among the hitherto warring nations. At Geneva, in Switzerland, is the seat of the League of Nations. Here is the permanent Secretariat. Here meets annually the Assembly of the League of Nations. Here periodically the Council of the League of Nations is in session.

THE PEACEFUL SWISS ALWAYS PREPARED FOR DEFENSE

So if there be any place in the world where the sentiment for peace is strong, it is Switzerland. And yet, if there be any people that are prepared constantly, every man of them, to fight in defense of his rights, and to fight in defense of peace, it is the Swiss. For centuries the Swiss have been known as skillful and courageous fighters. The French monarchs formerly engaged Swiss guards for the protection of their persons. Even to this good day, the Swiss guards constitute one of the most picturesque features of the Vatican. Fortunately, the Swiss have wisely found the safe middle ground between extreme and expensive militarism on the one hand and pitiful and helpless unprepardness on the other. The Swiss citizen is a very realistic person. He looks the world square in the face. He knows that force still has its place in the world. The Swiss draws a lesson from the fact that no little town in a Christian country, where the people all know each other, and many of them interrelated by blood or marriage, all speaking the same language, all professing the same religion, all sending their children to the same school, yet no such little town can be found but must have its policeman, with his pistol and his billet to compel the unruly and lawless minority to obey the will of the sober and law-abiding majority.

THE SAFE AND SANE MIDDLE GROUND

How did the Swiss find this happy middle ground between the perils of militarism, which may provoke aggressive war, and the equal perils of pacifism, which may invite agressive war? Two salient features may be pointed out as the explanation. First is, they have practically eliminated the professional soldier. There are very few professional soldiers on the pay rolls of the Swiss Government. Those few consist of highly trained and very capable officers who study to keep abreast of the military art so as to impart their information to the citizen soldiers at their annual training periods. The Swiss have found, what other nations can find if they seek, that the art of war is not so complex, nor so modern, as to require the entire time and thought of officers in order to keep them posted. The Swiss have discovered that their officers can give to their families and to their business enough time to continue in the working world as producers, and yet out of their leisure and during their holidays, be able to devote sufficient attention to the progress in the military art as to keep fully abreast. I feel safe in asserting that you will find in banks, in law offices, in mercantile establishments, in factories, and upon the farms of Switzerland, busy men who hold commissions as officers in the citizen army of Switzerland, who are the equals in general intelligence and in special knowledge and technical skill in the military art of any professional full-time officers drawing all-the-year pay from the public treasury in any country. These citizen soldiers have the civilian point of view. Their careers are connected with civil life. Therefore, ambition to win fame and honor upon the field of battle are not dominant forces in their lives. Their attitude is naturally defensive. They say to other nations:

If you let us alone, we will let you alone. But if you invade us, we are prepared to defend our soil and to destroy you in your efforts to destroy us.

The second important factor in explaining why Switzerland has maintained the safe middle ground in preparedness is that the private soldier feels an individual responsibility to fit himself in the highest possible degree to defend his country and his country's liberties. Here we escape pacifism. Every male citizen is expected to take proper training in the use of arms and in cooperative action with his fellow citizens in fighting. These two things constitute the essentials of military training. A good rifleman may understand how to shoot, but he must also understand how to get himself in the proper position in company with large numbers of his fellow citizens, in order that their combined and cooperative fighting may be effective against the combined and cooperative fighting of the enemy. Consequently the Swiss Army is a democratic army. Its ideals are as democratic as the civil and business and industrial and commercial institutions with which the people are familiar. Every private soldier has it in his power by skill and initia-

tive to rise to the grade of noncommissioned officer. Every noncommissioned officer is encouraged and trained so that the best, the most capable in skill, in knowledge, and in the quality of leadership, are given commissioned rank. Therefore, the officers in the Swiss Army represent natural leaders just as the leaders among the lawyers at the bar, just as the leaders in the banking world, just as the leaders in the commercial and industrial world have won their positions of leadership by ability, by character, and by the power to inspire confidence in others. This is the very essence of leadership.

THE ECONOMY OF A CITIZEN ARMY

Consequently the military defense forces of Switzerland are very inexpensive. The cost is a mere bagatelle in comparison with the cost per capita in many other countries, including the United States. I will gather the figures and put them into the RECORD later, so that the contrast in expense may show impressively that the only escape from the weight of land armaments in our country is to gradually modify our military system from one so largely and dominantly professional to a voluntary citizen army. I previously called attention to this fact in connection with my comments upon a very able discussion of this general subject by Gen. John M. Palmer, United States Army, retired, in his book entitled "Statesmen or War." He shows very clearly how, if we Members of Congress are to be real statesmen in connection with preparedness, we will draw more lessons from the experience of Switzerland and will insure that our Nation will never in the future enter upon aggressive warfare, but that we will always be prepared to defend ourselves against the ambition and the greed of other nations.

THE RIFLE ESSENTIAL TO EVERY SOLDIER

Now this all leads to the question of encouraging civilian rifle practice. The rifle is the elemental and indispensable weapon of every soldier. The soldier may later turn to artillery, or to machine guns, or to tanks, or to gas warfare, or to airplanes, but the beginning of his training must include a knowledge of how to use small firearms. For a man to know how to shoot accurately, to be familiar with the loading and the care of a rifle and pistol, gives confidence and creates self-respect. Therefore, the larger the number of men in the United States connected with civil life who are good riflemen, the better our Nation will be prepared for defense. These expert riflemen, learning to shoot in a civilian rifle club, can be employed with great benefit in the training of soldiers hastily called out of civil life in the event of war. To obtain a knowledge of the necessary elements of drill is a matter of a few weeks to a person of average intelligence. To become a good shot is a matter of experience of months, and sometimes years. We will never have universal military training in America. It is contrary to the genius of American institutions. But we have always had voluntary military training for a part of our citizens. The larger the number of citizens willing to submit to voluntary training, the smaller the number of citizens whom we must enroll as regular soldiers and keep on the pay roll all the year round.

There is an essential difference and even antagonism between the voluntary soldier and the mercenary soldier. There is a sort of essential antagonism between the professional soldier and the citizen soldier. The professional soldier is disposed to look down with contempt upon the military fitness of the citizen soldier. The citizen soldier reciprocates this feeling and nurses the grudges of the unfairness and injustice that he has suffered at the hands of the professional soldier during periods of training and during the stress of war.

MORE VOLUNTEERS MEANS FEWER MERCENARIES

I stand for increasing the number of voluntary soldiers in the United States; for increasing the number of men who are willing to train, to study, to submit to discipline, and thus to be prepared to fight the Nation's battles in a war of defense. We submit to a regular, mercenary, professional army only as a matter of necessity. If we could have equally well-trained officers and equally well-trained soldiers without having to pay them all the time and without the incidental encouragement they give to the militaristic spirit, we would welcome such a change. For this reason the American Legion, made up exclusively of citizens who were formerly, for a period of time, enlisted in the defense of the Nation's rights and of the Nation's life, stands for the voluntary spirit in war. The American Legion wants to encourage the citizen soldier. The American Legion wants adequate preparedness at the minimum of necessary expense. For this reason the American Legion has set up a program of having at least 12,000 civilian rifle clubs in the United States. Perhaps there will be more than 12,000 such clubs before the full program is developed. There will probably be other American Legion posts established, and at any rate there will be communities where there is now no American Legion post, which will organize rifle clubs. Some cities, where there is only one American Legion post, will have two or more rifle clubs.

So the question is, What encouragement will Congress give to the formation and maintenance of these clubs? Will Congress furnish the rifles, which are in storage for use by these clubs? Will Congress furnish the ammunition, which is now in storage and annually depreciating and deteriorating, for use by these clubs? Will Congress furnish some money to encourage sending teams to visit the annual matches and some money to buy trophies for the winners at the annual matches? If Congress will do these things, then if we do become involved in another major war the military authorities then in control will find that the money now proposed to be spent upon these rifle clubs will pay dividends one hundred and perhaps one thousand fold. The citizen who has never had on a uniform but who knows how to use a rifle accurately and quickly is a potential soldier of the finest sort. Such a soldier as Alvin York, familiar with the use of the rifle in hunting squirrels or turkeys or other big game, became in battle the equal of a hundred or a thousand soldiers not entirely familiar with the use of the rifle. The miraculous success of Andrew Jackson at New Orleans is explained not alone by his own dauntless courage and his own matchless leadership but also by the fact that the backwoodsmen who constituted the rank and file of his army had learned through years of practice in the woods to use their rifles with deadly effect. Such citizen, when called to the colors in time of war, is quickly and easily converted over into an efficient and capable soldier.

CIVILIANS MUST CONSTITUTE ANY SIZABLE ARMY

Therefore, the greatest and widest training should be carried on among civilians and such citizen soldiers as national guardsmen, with all the implements and instrumentalities of modern war. Our airplanes should be at the disposal of national guardsmen who want to learn how to do military flying. Machine guns should be at their disposal. The latest types of army tanks should be at their disposal. They should be constantly drilled and instructed in the use of poisonous gases. But they must not neglect the rifle. The rifle is the alphabet of the soldier. To learn its use is like learning the a, b, c's. With hundreds of thousands of our citizens familiar with the rifle, with the airplane, with the machine gun, with the tank, with the trench mortar, with the use of poisonous gases, it will be possible for our Nation to call together in short order an army composed of civilians that will and can defend our rights, protect our people, and repel the invader from our land.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I can agree with practically everything said by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCSWAIN] except that part of his remarks in favor of the amendment which seeks to add $50,000 to this item of $200,000 already in the bill. This activity of the civilian rifle clubs has been carried along for some time at just about the same level. The appropriation for some years past has been $200,000 for the civilian rifle clubs, and that is in addition to the $500,000 for national matches held

every year at Camp Perry and for other expenses in connection with the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice. It is to maintain these 1,600 clubs. The question is now whether we want to embark on a campaign or program that is going to increase these national rifle clubs without limit. If we start in here and add $50,000—and they have been seeking for several years, not by offering amendments on the floor, but by coming before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the War Department and asking that this sum be increased—there is no telling where it will end. They frankly tell us now that their program is to extend this activity to thousands of these clubs. A gentleman who appeared before the committee said 12,000 additional clubs. I believe this country should do everything possible to foster and promote marksmanship and proficiency in arms. Americans have always been noted for their proficiency in marksmanship and in arms. That is something we want to see maintained among our people, and if the $50,000 were necessary to do that, I would be just as much in favor of it as anyone.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. McSWAIN. If 112 clubs are now seeking for necessary aid in order to start, and there is not a sufficient fund, would it not seem to justify an appropriation of the additional $50,000?

Mr. BARBOUR. If we were neglecting this activity, I would be inclined to agree with the gentleman, but does the gentleman from South Carolina know what we are doing in this program that we are now carrying on?

Mr. McSWAIN. We have 1,600 clubs now, and we are doing well as far as we go.

Mr. BARBOUR. Just let me call the attention of the gentleman from South Carolina and of the other Members of the House to just what this country is doing in order to promote marksmanship and proficiency in arms at the present time in this very bill now before us.

For target practice there is carried in this bill for the Regular Army $3,034,960. That is for target practice alone. For the National Guard there is carried in this bill for target practice $2,246,531. For the Organized Reserves for target practice there is carried $614,792, for the Reserve Officers' Training Corps for target practice there is carried $345,476, for the citizens' military training camps for target practice, $95,649; for the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice for the national matches, $500,000; and for the civilian rifle clubs, $700,000, making a total for target practice already carried in this bill of $7,037,408. But that is not all. There is an item in this bill of $1,500,000 for additional pay to enlisted men in the Army because of proficiency in arms and in marksmanship. The latest figures that I have from the War Department are that over 16,000 enlisted men are drawing this additional pay, because of proficiency in marksmanship. If we were neglecting marksmanship in this country I would be inclined to vote for the amendment which the gentleman offers, but with more than eight and a half million dollars already in the bill to make ourselves in this country proficient in arms and in marksmanship, I think we are spending an adequate sum for this purpose.

Mr. McSWAIN. Will not the gentleman separate the items here for instruction in rifle practice for the civilian population?

Mr. BARBOUR. To my mind it is all for the same purpose, to foster and encourage proficiency in rifle practice in this country, and it does not make so much difference whether you do it as a civilian or as a National Guard man or as an Organized Reserve or as a Regular Army man. If you can shoot and hit the bull's-eye, you are a good marksman.

Mr. McSWAIN. Certainly, but the gentleman must realize this, that target practice for the Regular Army and for the National Army is an indispensable, essential part of the training, just like the drill and the uniforms.

It ought to be charged up to the entire establishment, and it is not fair, from an argumentative point of view to charge it against an effort to enlarge training amongst civilians who will be familiar with the rifle so that if a war does come they will then be prepared to continue to shoot straight just like Alvin York was. Alvin York learned to shoot at turkey shooting matches in east Tennessee, and he hit Germans as well as turkeys.

Mr. BARBOUR. It is not my intention to charge this to the civilian activities. I just wanted to show to the Members of the House the total amount of money carried in this bill for marksmanship and proficiency in arms so that you would understand it is not being neglected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

CALIFORNIA DÉBRIS COMMISSION

For defraying the expenses of the commission in carrying on the work authorized by the act approved March 1, 1893 (U. S. C., title 33, sec. 661), $17,350.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. There is a subsequent item that refers to an appropriation of $1,000,000 for the work of flood control on the Sacramento River.

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes. That is under flood control.

Mr. STAFFORD. That has been running along for a number of years. What is the special work that is accomplished by that appropriation? I believe this California Débris Commission is in control of that.

Mr. BARBOUR. That is a different proposition. This California Débris Commission is in control of the débris that is washed down from the mines up in the mountains. It is still coming because of the old hydraulic mining done in the early days.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thought that was the justification for the $1,000,000 appropriation for the Sacramento River.

Mr. BARBOUR. Well, in a way, it was, but the débris commission is a board which studies and keeps in touch with that situation.

Mr. STAFFORD. This California Débris Commission has authority over the expenditure of this $1,000,000, as I recall it?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. The only justification for this appropriation of $1,000,000 which has been appropriated for several years is that the waters came down from the mountains above Sacramento and there should be some Federal appropriation to control the works.

Mr. BARBOUR. There are two different propositions. There is flood control and navigation and there is the matter of taking care of the débris that comes down and interferes with the navigation of the stream. Of course, the two are somewhat related.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is not much navigation up there, is there?

Mr. BARBOUR. In the Sacramento River there is a great deal of navigation as far as Sacramento and somewhat beyond.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the character of navigation?

Mr. BARBOUR. It is passenger and freight.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thought the people of California were faster moving than to go by boat, by the slow process of navigation up the Sacramento River.

Mr. BARBOUR. Well, it is a very delightful overnight trip. You can make it in three hours on a train easily, or you can leave San Francisco by boat in the early evening and be in Sacramento in the morning in time for breakfast. It is a delightful, restful trip by river, and a great many people take it.

Mr. STAFFORD. In order to provide a good night's rest for sleepy Californians, you are asking us to appropriate $1,000,000 for navigation?

Mr. BARBOUR. Even for people from Wisconsin it might do a lot of good.

Mr. STAFFORD. It might do a lot of good, but as they are fast actors out there, they would not think of taking a boat to travel a short distance like that when they could travel by train in three hours. They would likely take this metal-clad airship. No. I do not believe they would take that, because they are too wise to experiment with a thing as dangerous as that.

Mr. BARBOUR. I am sure if the gentleman were out there and wanted to have a delightful night's rest he could not enjoy anything more than a trip on one of these boats to Sacramento.

Mr. STAFFORD. Perhaps I would need a refreshing night's rest after the wild life in San Francisco.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Not only do they have a line of steamers such as described by the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR], but there is a heavy tonnage handled on the Sacramento River.

Mr. STAFFORD. Consisting of what, other than logs?

Mr. McDUFFIE. The rail lines do not closely parallel the Sacramento River, and there are a number of towns between Sacramento and San Francisco which are served by this line of steamers, which are packet boats. This line also runs on as far as Stockton.

Mr. STAFFORD. I had heard of the packet-boat line, but I never knew they had much passenger travel.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I was surprised myself to learn that. I do not recall the figures just now, but the engineer's report shows a vast amount of tonnage on the Sacramento River.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, there is no question about the tonnage as far as logs are concerned.

Mr. McDUFFIE. And this is also high-class tonnage, fruits and vegetables.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor works, and for the prosecution of such projects heretofore authorized as may be most desirable in the interests of commerce and navigation; for survey of northern and northwestern lakes, Lake of the Woods, and other boundary and connecting waters between the said lake and Lake Superior, Lake Champlain, and the natural navigable waters embraced in the navigation system of the New York canals, including all necessary expenses for preparing, correcting, extending, printing, binding, and issuing charts and bulletins and of investigating lake levels with a view to their regulation; for examinations, surveys, and contingencies of rivers and harbors: *Provided*, That no funds shall be expended for any preliminary examination, survey, project, or estimate not authorized by law; and for the prevention of obstructive and injurious deposits within the harbor and adjacent waters of New York City, for pay of inspectors, deputy inspectors, crews, and office force, and for maintenance of patrol fleet and expenses of office, $60,000,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, on page 71, line 18, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BLANTON: Page 71, line 18, strike out the words "preliminary examination."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak for five minutes out of order.

Mr. BARBOUR. Well, Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we are trying to finish this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. I have not used a moment on this bill.

Mr. BARBOUR. But we are trying to get it out of the way, so that another bill can come on for general debate.

Mr. BLANTON. I could speak for five minutes on these two words, but I would like to mention a convention that is being held in this city.

Mr. BARBOUR. I know the gentleman could speak for more than five minutes.

I will not object in this instance, Mr. Chairman, with the understanding that this shall not be a precedent for any similar request, because if there is a similar request I shall have to object.

Mr. BLANTON. I shall not ask for any further time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, there is now in session in this city a convention of delegates from the oil-producing States, called by the governors of those States, to devise some means of relief for the independent oil operators of the country. They have their backs to the wall, caused by imports of foreign oil annually entered free, and must have tariff protection at once.

They held a most enlightening meeting in the House caucus room this morning which Senators, Representatives in Congress, and a great number of delegates from the oil-producing States attended. I listened to some splendid addresses there, one of which was worthy of special mention, that made by Mr. Wirt Franklin, of Oklahoma City. Mr. Franklin, fortunately for the independent producers, is a man of wealth. He has spent, so I am reliably told, out of his own pocket about $200,000 in efforts to aid and assist those engaged in his industry and to collect information and facts on the subject he so ably discussed. He made a most valuable statement before that meeting in the House caucus room this morning. It has so much important information and so many important facts correlated in it, which I have been trying to get for a long time, and which I am sure the Members of Congress from the various oil-producing States have been trying to get for a long time, that I would like to have it go in the RECORD in connection with my remarks. I ask unanimous consent to incorporate the statement he made in the caucus room this morning as a part of my remarks.

Mr. BARBOUR. Who made the statement?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Wirt Franklin, of Oklahoma City, who is the president of the Independent Oil Producers' Association in that portion of the United States.

Mr. PARKS. He is the man who is fighting the Standard Oil Co. and Shell people.

Mr. BLANTON. Do not say that, because some friend of the big Dutch Shell Co. might come in here and object to the remarks going in the RECORD.

Mr. PARKS. Maybe they did not hear me.

Mr. BLANTON. These facts are of importance to the whole country, and this industry just now is the very life of a part of my district. Right now there are many farmers out of jobs who have been making a living for their wives and little children by reason of the independent oil industry in my district, and they have been able in this way to make a living when they have not been able to make ends meet out of their farms.

Mr. PARKS. And the same thing is true in my district.

Mr. BLANTON. When the independent operators were getting $1.50 a barrel for their oil they were paying these farm boys $10 and $12 a day for truck hauling, for casing crews, for tool dressing, and tower shifts. There were hundreds of them employed in all of the oil counties of my district, and they were given needed and remunerative employment by the independent oil operators, but now they are all out of jobs. Oil has gone down to-day another 25 cents, thus reducing the price in Texas to about 60 cents a barrel, and under the proration existing, men who have little 10-barrel wells have been cut to five barrels per day production. They can not produce but five barrels per day, and you men know they can not do that except at a great loss.

I intended to see my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL] before I made this request. I notice that he is about to make his usual objection. And he renders valuable service along that line. I can assure him that this is of great importance to the country, to Pennsylvania, to Ohio, to Indiana, and to many of the States that are now

crippled by reason of the independent producers having their backs to the wall. It is of great importance to the country, and I hope my friend from Massachusetts will let it go in.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I was interested in the gentleman's statement that the price of oil was very low.

Mr. BLANTON. It is down to 60 cents a barrel, as there was a cut of 25 cents to-day in Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I was about to say that there was a cut of 25 cents yesterday.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; which reduced it to 60 cents a barrel, and the big Dutch Shell Co. can lay down gasoline in New York to-day from its South American plant for 4 cents a gallon and it sells here for 16 cents a gallon.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, if I thought that the insertion of this speech in the RECORD would give employment to one individual outside of the Printing Office, or if I thought it would improve the oil situation in any State, I would not object; but, Mr. Chairman, the increase in the cost of publishing the RECORD last year was $175,000 plus. There are just 560 subscribers outside of Congress to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Each Member of the House has 60 copies and each Member of the Senate has 80 copies, and the cost of printing the RECORD is more than the cost of printing anything else in the Printing Office in connection with any Government activity.

Mr. BLANTON. Yet the people get more value for this money than from any other we spend.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I do not yield to the gentleman, and I did not interrupt him. It has become a scandal. The RECORD is for recording the procedure of this House, a legitimate function, and to have it on file for posterity or for the convenience of the Members.

Mr. BLANTON. I am going to act in good faith with my friend from California [Mr. BARBOUR], who allowed me this time, and I am going to withdraw my request for the time being, if it is going to provoke an argument.

(Subsequently the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. UNDERHILL, withdrew his objection, and by unanimous consent the gentleman from Texas, Mr. BLANTON, was granted permission to incorporate in the RECORD as a part of his remarks the statement made by Mr. Wirt Franklin.)

The statement is as follows:

SPEECH OF WIRT FRANKLIN TO GOVERNORS' OIL RELIEF CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 15, 1931

We have been called together to-day by the governors of the oil-producing States for the purpose of working out plans for prompt relief for the present dire distress in the petroleum industry. The situation is so serious as to merit the best thought of the leaders from the several States involved in the solution of our difficulties.

That we may understand the many problems with which we are confronted and the underlying causes of our existing depression, I deem it advisable to review briefly the history of the industry for the past 10 years, the policies and purposes of those in authority, and the leaders of the industry, which have had considerable influence in bringing about, if they are not directly responsible for, the present conditions.

Let us go back to the year 1921, when conditions very similar to those of the present were prevalent in the petroleum industry, brought about at that time by vast importations of oil, chiefly from Mexico. Then there was under consideration in the Committee on Ways and Means, at that time under the chairmanship of Mr. Fordney, the question of giving protection to this industry by the levying of a tariff on imported crude oil. The Committee on Ways and Means of the House had voted a tariff on oil in the then pending bill, and President Harding at that time, in a letter to Mr. Fordney requesting that a tariff on oil be omitted from the bill, for the first time declared the Government's policy of so-called conservation, which will be more fully analyzed and defined after I have traced its course and effect from that date to the present time. Congress failed to give oil the protection to which it was then entitled; but the Mexican Government shortly thereafter levied an export tax upon oil which, to some extent at least, was an aid to the domestic industry. Thereafter the production of oil in Mexico gradually declined, while exploration and development work was begun in Venezuela, Colombia, and other South American countries.

In 1924, continuing the policy first enunciated by President Harding in 1921, President Coolidge appointed four members of his Cabinet as the Federal Oil Conservation Board, with the Secretary of the Interior as chairman. This board held hearings for the purpose of determining the extent of our petroleum reserves. The aid of the American Petroleum Institute was asked and given, and the country was alarmed at the reports emanating from the board and leaders of the petroleum industry that our petroleum reserves were in danger of exhaustion within a few years, and that even our safety as a nation was at stake. This was no new thing, as men prominent in the industry and others had for years, from time to time, made predictions of the early exhaustion of our oil resources. The rank and file of the producing branch of the business paid little heed to the hearings before the Federal Oil Conservation Board, or to the warnings of those timid souls who prophesied the early demise of the petroleum industry in the United States. They did not believe these predictions, thought them harmless, and did not then foresee the results of their indifference.

The major factors in the industry, many of whom held large concessions in Central and South America, participated in the hearings and aided in the dissemination to the people and the officials of the State and Federal Governments of information tending to convince the country of the early exhaustion of this irreplaceable natural resource, and to crystalize public sentiment in favor of hoarding our supplies, unused, for future generations. For years the press has been filled, to such an extent as to amount to propaganda, with the predictions and forebodings of these prophets of disaster. Whatever merit this so-called conservation policy had at its inception, subsequent developments have conclusively shown that the same was founded upon a false foundation of fact; that the use of the word "conservation" in connection with this policy was not in its true sense; that instead it meant reservation of our supplies in the ground, and the effect has been to mislead the people into believing that we were wasting our petroleum resources, which was far from the truth.

In 1928 it became apparent that there was an oversupply of oil being thrown upon the markets of the United States, due to increasing domestic production and increasing imports, chiefly from Venezuela. The American Petroleum Institute created a committee on world production and consumption, the avowed purpose of which was to bring about a curtailment of production in the United States and a curtailment of imports, so as to bring production and imports in balance with consumption. Elaborate plans were formulated early in 1929, were submitted to the Federal Oil Conservation Board, and by that board referred to the Attorney General for the purpose of ascertaining whether the plan could be carried out without violation of the antitrust laws. The Attorney General could not promise immunity, and the work of the committee, covering the production of the country as a whole, was discontinued. In lieu thereof committees for curtailment of production were set to work in the various States, under the authority of State laws where same existed, and these State committees and subcommittees in the various districts within the States have succeeded to a remarkable degree in reducing the production of oil within the United States. As a corollary of this work and as a part of it, the plan contemplated the curtailment of production in the countries of South America, particularly Venezuela, which, had it succeeded, would have resulted in a reduction of imports of crude oil and refined products into the United States.

In the early part of 1929 Mr. M. L. Requa, reported at the time to be acting in behalf of President Hoover, called upon the governors of the several oil-producing States to enlist their aid in holding a conference of the petroleum industry, and later called such a conference to meet at Colorado Springs, Colo., on June 10, 1929. This conference was attended by several of the governors and also by a large number of delegates from the various oil-producing States, representing all branches of the industry. The conference was opened by Mr. Requa, with a statement of the aims thereof. Doctor Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior, again announced the conservation policies of the Federal Oil Conservation Board, and Dr. George Otis Smith, Director of the United States Geological Survey, among other things, stated, in substance, that the next 10 years would in all probability see the exhaustion of our petroleum reserves to the point of endangering national defense. The doctrine of conservation was again expounded, and the delegates representing the various States were asked to form a compact among the States producing oil, which compact, when adopted and approved by Congress, would become the supreme law of the land; a commission would be appointed under the authority of the compact, with power to regulate and control the production of oil, to determine how much oil should be produced within the United States, and to allocate that production among the several oil-producing States.

When it became apparent that the real purpose of the meeting was not conservation in its real and accepted sense, but that the purpose was, by degrees and from time to time, to reduce the production of oil in the United States, and reserve our supplies in the ground for an indefinite period to come, and at the same time import our requirements in large part from foreign countries, the Colorado Springs conference adjourned, without having accomplished anything whatever toward the consummation of the purpose for which it was called.

However, this conference had far-reaching effects. It revealed, in all its hideousness, to the rank and file of the petroleum industry the true intent and purposes of those who had been fostering and promoting the so-called conservation program, to shut in domestic production, to stop development, to reserve our oil supplies in the ground, to be developed and used after the foreign supplies have been exhausted, and to turn the markets for petroleum in the United States (approximately 70 per cent of the markets of the world) over to a few large companies engaged in exploiting the petroleum reserves of South America and in importing the production thereof into the United States. If there has been any doubt as to these intents and purposes in the past, all doubt must now be dispelled, since under date of January 6, 1931, Secretary Wilbur, after having received an invitation from the Governors of Oklahoma and Kansas to participate in this conference, gave to the Associated Press an interview declaring himself against a tariff on oil, and saying, if he is correctly quoted by the press: "The chief result would be that the big companies, which now have many wells shut in and not in operation, would open them up, adding to the production. Overproduction is the basic ill of the industry."

It might be pertinent at this time to inquire what big companies have advised Secretary Wilbur in advance as to how they would defeat any beneficial results from a tariff on oil. The honorable Secretary also said: "In the future the country with the oil will dominate civilization. In it will be centered the wealth. America must conserve her supply. If we waste our oil reserves now we will pay foreign countries through the nose for every barrel we import later. If I were the landlord of this country I would see that we used as much imported oil as possible, and let the other fellow waste his reserves."

The last-quoted sentence is a full and complete admission of the purposes of those promoting the so-called conservation movement—to turn over to four companies, chiefly engaged in importing oil, the entire markets of the United States, even though it might mean the destruction of one of the greatest industries in the United States, the impoverishment of a section of the United States and of the people thereof, almost, if not quite, one-third the area of the entire country, with a population of some 22,000,000 of people, and a civilization builded upon the oil industry.

In speaking thus does the honorable Secretary present to the public the views of the administration or is he simply holding fast to ideas and convictions acquired some years ago under circumstances which might then have excused the views, but which, in the light of subsequent events, are indeed archaic?

The conference at Colorado Springs having failed to bring forth a compact under which production could be controlled, the efforts, by voluntary cooperation and in some States under the provisions of State law, to curtail production, proceeded with remarkable success. Indeed, the figures are startling. We find that for the week ending August 24, 1929, the production of crude oil in the United States averaged 2,975,435 barrels per day, and for the week ending January 3, 1931, 2,082,100 barrels per day, or a curtailment in production in that period, brought about by the cooperation on the part of small and large producers alike throughout the country, of 893,335 barrels daily. We will produce in the United States this year approximately 100,000,000 barrels of oil less than we did in the year 1929, and while we have been reducing the domestic production 100,000,000 barrels the importers have, during 1930, brought into the United States and thrown upon our markets, duty free, more than 100,000,000 barrels of crude oil and refined products. In fact, the imports of gasoline during the first nine months of 1930 increased 125 per cent over the same period of 1929.

The report of the committee on economics of the American Petroleum Institute at its Chicago meeting, November 10, 1930, shows that each 5,000,000 barrels of gasoline imported would displace, for the six months ending March 31, 1931, 114,000 barrels daily of domestic production, while the report of the economics committee appointed by Secretary Wilbur to forecast the demand for petroleum products and ascertain and allocate oil production necessary to supply that demand for the six months ending March 31, 1931, shows that each barrel of gasoline imported displaces from the market 4 barrels of domestic crude. Crude oil, gasoline, and other refined products imported in the year 1930 have displaced from the market approximately 400,000 barrels daily of domestic production.

Since for a period of more than seven years there has been an intense propaganda fostered and promoted throughout the country in the daily press and in many of the Nation's most prominent magazines to convince the public of the early exhaustion of the petroleum reserves of the United States, it appears advisable at this point to outline briefly some of the former estimates of future oil production in the United States and later to call attention to the vast petroleum reserves which we actually possess. It would also be pertinent to inquire what forces and organizations, corporate or individual, have promoted and paid for this propaganda and who are the beneficiaries thereof. An inquiry of this nature properly and fairly conducted would, in all probability, go far toward explaining the so-called conservation movement and why it has been urged for a period of years.

In referring to the former estimates of future recoverable petroleum reserves let me state in advance that I do not wish to reflect whatever upon the good faith of the eminent engineers and other authorities making these estimates, but the recital of these estimates in the light of subsequent information will demonstrate how easily even the most eminent and learned can be mistaken on this subject and will show further that, perhaps, the present advocates of the reservation of our petroleum reserves safely in the ground may be mistaken.

1908: David T. Day estimated minimum of 8,500,000,000 barrels. Estimated a maximum of 15,000,000,000 to 22,500,000,000 barrels from 1908 to 1930, inclusive, United States has produced 11,442,447,000 barrels, all of Day's minimum, plus 33 per cent.

1914: Ralph Arnold estimated future production at 5,700,000,000 barrels. From 1914 to 1930, inclusive, United States produced 10,079,396,000 barrels, all of Arnold's estimate, plus over 80 per cent.

1915: United States Geological Survey estimated future production at 7,600,000,000 barrels; 1915 to 1930, inclusive, United States has produced 9,813,633,000 barrels, all of that estimated, plus 29 per cent.

1921: Certain petroleum geologists of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists estimated future production at 9,150,000,000 barrels 1921 to 1930, inclusive, United States produced 7,719,222,000 barrels, nearly 85 per cent in 9 years.

1925: The committee of 11 appointed by the Federal Oil Conservation Board estimated future production from proven acreage on present methods 5,300,000,000 barrels; 1925 to 1930, inclusive, United States has produced from these properties and new pools 5,243,161,000, almost 99 per cent.

1930: In the year 1930 the United States, according to best estimates available at the present time, produced 901,000,000 barrels, compared with 1,005,598,000 barrels in 1929.

1859 to 1930, inclusive: From beginning to date the United States has produced a total of 13,149,090,000 barrels.

The production curve has been on the upgrade for several years. The country could have produced this year, had there been any demand for it, several hundred million barrels in excess of that which was produced.

In 1913 the United States produced 248,446,000 barrels. In 1929 Oklahoma alone produced over 253,000,000 barrels, or more oil than the entire United States produced in so recent a year as 1913. Oklahoma produces a billion barrels of oil each four years; it is capable of producing a billion barrels each year, if the demand called for such development. The same is true of Texas and California. It is highly probable that any one of the States of Oklahoma, Texas, and California can produce as much oil as the entire United States has produced to date. The oil resources of these States loom larger with each passing year, as deeper drilling and exploration work is done. These States are getting the development at this time, and have for a number of years last past. Other States would leap forward accordingly if development to a like extent were done within their borders.

The production of the United States has been swinging upward from the discovery of oil to the present time—a period of 72 years. When we consider that the vast domain from the Canadian line to the Gulf of Mexico, lying immediately east of the Rocky Mountains, as well as the Pacific Coast States, is potential oil territory, practically undeveloped and unexplored at this time, it is apparent that the production curve will be on the upward trend for many years to come; and that when said curve starts downward, if that day ever comes, we will produce from our then known reserves of oil as much or more oil than has been produced prior to the day when the decline curve will start on its downward course.

What I have heretofore said has been applicable to reserves of oil to be produced from oil wells. Let us now consider the vast reserves contained in the oil-shale deposits in the States of Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Indiana, and other States. These deposits have been accurately surveyed, their oil content measured, and suffice it to say that in one deposit in Colorado alone the experts of the Government and the Colorado Bureau of Mines are agreed that there are 80,000,000,000 barrels of recoverable oil, should it ever become necessary to use the same.

We have in the coal deposits of the United States, which are more than 50 per cent of the coal deposits of the world, another great source of oil, so great indeed that it is difficult for the human mind to comprehend. By hydrogenation, oil and its derivatives, including gasoline, can be successfully produced from coal. It is not at all improbable that the perfection of this process, using coal, or the discovery of some other form of power, may within a few years make our present oil reserves all but valueless.

Secretary Wilbur and other protagonists of so-called conservation continually speak of wasting our oil reserves, when, as a matter of fact, we are only using them without waste. It is certainly not fair to continually tell the public that the American petroleum industry is wasting our valuable oil reserves when the country is utilizing this great natural resource for the creation of new wealth within the country. This is the oil age. Let us utilize our oil while it is yet valuable and before the discovery of some new form of power which may supersede oil for the generation of power. It is the utmost folly to continue on a program which perhaps was conceived with honesty of intentions, but which has outlived its usefulness and has become destructive in a superlative degree. Imagine for a moment, if you will, that men of similar vision to those promoting the so-called oil conservation policy of the present day had been directing the policies of the Government and the course of business from the foundation of our country until the present time; that, acknowledging our natural resources, the products of our mines, were irreplace-

able, they should be preserved for use at some distant day; and that, instead of developing our natural resources and utilizing them, we had clung tenaciously to a policy of so-called conservation or reservation, then this great country of ours would now be, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, an undeveloped expanse of almost unbroken wilderness; the few inhabitants thereof a pastoral people; the great civilization which we have builded and the great industrial and commercial development which has taken place as yet undreamed of.

What has made the United States the most enlightened, the most prosperous, the most advanced in all lines of endeavor of any nation in the world, has been the utilization of our natural resources. It would be just as logical to contend that we should import our iron ore, our lumber, our lead, coal, zinc, and other mineral products, reserving our supplies thereof in this country for some future national emergency, as it is to insist that we should import our requirements of oil. In fact, Russia is at this time willing to sell us all these things at a price less than our cost of production, and France, Great Britain, and other nations indebted to the United States would willingly pay their war debts by sending to us all of these products. How any patriotic American citizen can advocate such a policy is beyond comprehension.

We have heard a great deal and read more in the daily press and the oil journals concerning the overproduction of crude oil in the United States. As a matter of fact, during the last 12 years (1918 to 1929, inclusive), there has not been an overproduction in the United States, but there has been an oversupply. During that period we have imported 950,000,000 barrels of crude oil. During that period we lacked 600,000,000 barrels of producing as much oil as we consumed, but during the same period we added to storage of crude oil in the United States 350,000,000 barrels, which addition to storage, as may be seen by these figures, was occasioned almost wholly by importing more oil into this country than we had any need of, so that it clearly appears that the great burden upon the petroleum industry of carrying in storage nearly 700,000,000 barrels of crude and refined products was not occasioned by overproduction in the United States, but overimportation of foreign oils.

Now, let us inquire as to what effect the so-called conservation policy, coupled with the proration and curtailment movement and the importation of oil and refined products, has had upon the petroleum industry in the United States. The price of crude oil at the well has been reduced from time to time, until now it is being sold very much below the cost of production, except in isolated pools of new and large flush production, although, as before stated, we have reduced the production since the peak week in August, 1929, nearly 900,000 barrels daily, and the average price of crude oil throughout the country has, during the same period, been reduced more than one-third in price.

The case of Oklahoma is typical of all the rest. During the week ending August 24, 1929, the production of Oklahoma was 735,750 barrels per day, and for all of this production there was a ready market. Since then, by cooperative effort, and in line with the published suggestions of the Federal Oil Conservation Board and the requests of the major purchasers of oil in that State, the production has been reduced until in the week ending January 3, 1931, the State of Oklahoma actually produced only 448,900 barrels daily, or a reduction in the production during that period of 286,850 barrels daily. This has been accomplished in that State, in the face of the fact that the State could, with ease, supply sufficient oil to furnish the entire markets of the United States at the present time and for a long time to come from production already developed.

The proration movement and the curtailment of production in the various oil-producing States was inaugurated ostensibly for the purpose of stabilizing the petroleum industry, of preventing additions to storage, and balancing supply with demand. It has been a success only in so far as it has proved the ability of the industry to cooperate and accomplish curtailment of production. As production has been reduced, imports have absorbed the market demand theretofore supplied by domestic oil, and instead of the price of oil being stabilized, it has been steadily reduced until we are now almost upon a competitive basis, so far as prices are concerned, with cheap Venezuelan oil. One of two things must happen, and soon. Either imports of crude oil and refined products must be curtailed, and the price thereof equalized with domestic products by the imposition of an adequate tariff, or the petroleum industry must be permanently placed upon a competing basis, so far as price is concerned, with the foreign oil. In fact, this is being gradually brought about, and it will not be many months before the destruction of the petroleum industry in the United States is complete. Already some 30,000 small wells in northeastern Oklahoma and southeastern Kansas have lost their market, due to the inability of the Prairie Oil & Gas Co. to continue purchasing oil in the mid-continent field.

As stated by Mr. M. L. Requa, in opening the Colorado Springs conference, there are in the United States approximately 250,000 wells, with an average production of one barrel per day each. In addition to that, there are some 50,000 wells with an average production of five barrels per day each. In the aggregate, these wells have a settled production of over 500,000 barrels. They have been operated at a loss for more than three years. Many of them are being abandoned and plugged each week, under the benign influence of the present so-called conservation program. Ultimately these wells will all be lost, and in the name of conservation 300,000 small wells, with a daily production of 500,000 barrels, and with recoverable reserves of oil of hundreds of millions of barrels, will have been destroyed. To save these wells would be true conservation, and it is within the power of the Federal Government to save them if it will. As they are being abandoned, the oil-field laborer, with his family, living on the lease and operating these wells, has been thrown out of employment. He knows no other kind of work, and under present conditions could not obtain employment if he did. There are literally thousands of these families at the present time dependent upon charity, and I can say, with feeling and in truth, that these men are native Americans, the kind that do not ask for charity—they do not wish to receive it—but who only claim the right by honest toil to support themselves and families.

Conservation has been tried as a remedy for the demoralization of the petroleum industry, and it has miserably failed and will continue to fail as long as imported oil and refined products absorb the market demand as fast as domestic production is reduced. The domestic petroleum industry is being ruthlessly destroyed in the name of conservation. The purchasing power of the oil-producing States has been reduced by hundreds of millions of dollars. The welfare of the petroleum industry is no longer of local significance. If one-third of the area of the United States, with a population of 22,000,000 of people, is impoverished to the point where the inhabitants can not purchase from the industrial and manufacturing sections of the country those things which a civilized and highly developed community need, there can be no industrial and commercial recovery in the United States for many years to come.

The civilization of the Southwest has been builded upon oil and the allied and kindred industries dependent upon the petroleum industry. If this industry is destroyed and the wealth and prosperity which it has created is transferred to some foreign country, this great civilization, until recent years prosperous and contented, will be destroyed, half of the people in the oil country must seek employment and outlets for their energies in other lines of industries already overcrowded. Most of them will be compelled to leave that country and the wonderful cities of the Southwest, builded for the most part by the oil industry, will become depopulated, and their magnificent office buildings become the roosting place of bats and sparrows.

We are met to-day in an attempt to work out a remedy for the appalling conditions in the petroleum industry with which we are confronted. All other principal industries of the United States, when suffering under similar conditions to that now prevailing in the petroleum industry, have been granted relief and given protection from foreign domination and control by a protective tariff. The principle of a protective tariff for industries being injured or destroyed by cheap foreign imports has become the settled policy of this Government. Both the Democratic and Republican Parties, in their platforms in the year 1928, strongly indorsed such protection to American industries, and I would again remind you that Vice President Curtis, in campaigning for the election of the present administration in a tour of the mid-continent field, in that year promised the industry tariff protection, and we all know that he was sincere in his declarations.

When it became apparent in the latter part of January, 1930, after a drastic cut in the price of crude oil, without any economic reason therefor, that those major companies engaged in importing crude oil and refined products in the United States had not given the full measure of cooperation promised by them in curtailing their foreign production and imports commensurate with the curtailment of production in the United States, and after those same interests believed it was too late for the domestic producers to obtain relief from Congress in the then pending tariff bill, a mass meeting of the oil industry was held in Tulsa, Okla., on January 29, 1930. A large delegation of oil men arrived in Washington on February 3, 1930, and presented to President Hoover and to the Congress their plea for protection to this great basic industry. The tariff bill had then passed the House, had been reported by the Finance Committee to the floor of the Senate, and the time was too short within which to thoroughly acquaint the House and Senate with the true condition of the petroleum industry. Since then conditions have steadily grown worse, and most of the things which were then told Congress would happen, if we were not given protection, have transpired. Congress did include in the tariff bill a provision directing the Tariff Commission to investigate and report to Congress the cost of Venezuelan oil and refined products delivered at Gulf and Atlantic ports, and the cost of domestic oil delivered at the same ports, and we are now expecting that report to be completed within a few days. Certainly by such a provision in the tariff bill it was the intention of Congress, should the facts warrant, to grant us relief and protection at the next ensuing session of Congress. The kindly reception accorded us at the last session, the generous support given in such a short time by Congress, is assurance that when the Members realize the true facts in connection with this question, relief and protection will be granted.

Congress has recently had under consideration relief bills under which it is proposed to give relief in various sections of the country to the farmers and others. In the oil-producing States, as is generally known, the farmers and landowners own one-eighth royalty in all the oil and gas produced. The producing oil companies hold under lease, for future prospecting, millions of acres in all the oil-producing States on which a rental, usually $1 per acre, is being paid in addition to the bonus or purchase price of the leases themselves, from which the farmers in thousands of

instances have been able to pay off their mortgages and improve their farms, while the annual rental during recent years of crop failures and low prices for farm products has paid the taxes on their farms and in addition helped to support the farmers and their families. But with prevalent conditions in the petroleum industry, those engaged in the producing branch of the business, having had their resources and income severely reduced, are unable to continue paying these rentals, are surrendering the leases, and the farmers are being deprived of millions of dollars of income heretofore enjoyed by them. Literally thousands of men formerly employed in and near the oil fields are now idle, and the community funds raised in the adjacent cities and towns are being called upon to assist them. In addition the oil men themselves, in some districts where they are still able to raise the money, are contributing funds and, through committees, administering relief to the families of idle oil-field employees. How much better it would be for Congress to bring relief to the petroleum industry through a measure imposing a tariff on imported crude oil and refined products, which would bring revenue into the Federal Treasury, instead of by inaction on this measure making it necessary to appropriate millions from the Treasury for relief.

It was at one time argued by those importing crude oil into this country that there should be no tariff or other limitation on imports, because the crude oil was brought to the United States and gave employment to American capital and labor. This is no longer true. The Royal Dutch Shell has constructed and has had in operation for several years a refinery at Curacao, a Dutch island off the coast of Venezuela, the capacity of which has been increased in the last year to 250,000 barrels per day, while the Pan American Co., subsidiary of the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, has a refinery on the island of Aruba—also a Dutch island off the coast of Venezuela—of 110,000 barrels daily capacity. In addition to these, there are two smaller plants with an aggregate capacity of more than 30,000 barrels per day. Operating on cheap oil produced on the mainland, transported at a negligible cost to the refineries, and with transportation in tankers for the refined products from these huge refineries, the American petroleum industry is no longer able to compete in the world markets with them. He who can not visualize within the next few years the complete loss of our export market has little imagination indeed. The American companies now exporting oil to Europe will continue to export the same for some years to come, due to the fact that they have their own controlled outlets. It is from these refineries that the gasoline and other refined products come which absorb by leaps and bounds the market formerly supplied by Pennsylvania, New York, West Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, California, and the great mid-continent field, and which has made necessary the proration program and the vast curtailment in the production of the United States.

The Department of Commerce maintains in the capitals and most of the principal cities of the world commercial attachés for the purpose of advancing the commercial interest of the United States, and a large part of their duties is in assisting to secure additional market outlets for petroleum products produced and refined in the United States. At the same time Secretary Wilbur, of the Interior Department and chairman of the Federal Oil Conservation Board, is devoting his energies to reducing domestic production and encouraging these other countries to send their petroleum products to the markets of the United States.

Is the oil industry of this country to continue in the curtailment of production in an ever-increasing degree while the output of Venezuela and other South American countries continues to absorb the domestic market without paying one cent of taxation to support the Government of the United States, the States, or the legal subdivisions thereof, whereas the domestic oil industry is the most heavily taxed of any industry in the United States, paying first in most States a gross-production tax of 3 or 4 per cent of all the oil and gas produced, a State income tax, a Federal income tax, an ad valorem tax, capital-stock tax, and other taxes too numerous to mention?

But those engaged in importing oil will contend that there should be no tariff on imports, because our exports of petroleum are greater in value than our imports. If this argument is sound and of compelling force, then Congress should, without delay, repeal the tariff bill in its entirety, for on examination we find that on the following products, to wit, iron and steel, semimanufactured; steel-mill products; iron and steel, advanced manufacture; electrical machinery; industrial machinery; office appliances and printing machinery; automobiles and other vehicles; animal oils and fats; manufactured cotton; manufactures of wood; pigments, paints, and varnishes; soaps and toilet preparations; photographic goods; scientific and professional instruments; and musical instruments, the imports during the calendar year 1929 were $172,577,000, while the exports from the United States of the same products totaled $1,725,111,000. During the same year the foreign value of imported crude petroleum and refined products was $140,966,000, duty free, while the exports of the same products totaled, in American value, $531,173,000. Imports of petroleum, both crude and refined, in 1929 amounted to approximately 110,000,000 barrels (about 10 per cent in barrels of the domestic production), while in 1930 it is estimated that the total number of barrels of imports of both crude and refined products will be slightly in excess of 100,000,000 barrels, and the estimated production of crude oil in the United States for the year 1930 slightly in excess of 900,000,000 barrels. The imports of crude oil in 1930 have been reduced as compared with the year 1929, but the imports of gasoline and other refined products have been so greatly increased as to displace a much greater amount of domestic crude from the market than was the case in the year 1929.

Secretary Wilbur in his recent release to the Associated Press contended that since the imports were only about 10 per cent of our domestic crude production they were a negligible factor. But it is too well recognized as sound economics to require more than the mere statement thereof that a 10 per cent surplus of any commodity thrown on the market will demoralize completely the price structure of the whole supply, and this is what has occurred in the petroleum industry. A 10 per cent or even a 5 per cent surplus production of cotton, wheat, corn, or of any manufactured or industrial commodity has always brought about widespread depression and demoralization in the price structure of the commodity of which there is an oversupply on the market. Especially is this true in the case of oil and refined products when those engaged in producing and refining the same in Venezuela and other South American countries are able at will to increase the imports in any amount, so that the threat of the same continually hangs over the domestic market.

At the time of the last reduction in the price of crude oil in the mid-continent field, which reduction amounted to more than 25 per cent in the then average price, those companies posting the reduced price accompanied the same with the statement that it was made necessary because of competition. Certainly, it was not the competition of domestic production, because at the time of the posting of this crude price reduction, the cooperative movement to curtail production had reduced the same nearly 600,000 barrels per day in the United States; the companies posting the reduced prices for crude oil, after having promised full cooperation in the proration program, betrayed producers by withdrawing from storage 26,000,000 barrels of oil in the year 1930.

In recent months, imported gasoline has been sold in tanker lots in Atlantic seaports as low as 4 cents per gallon. Certainly it must have been the competition of this imported gasoline that made necessary the reduction in price of the domestic product. This reduction in the price of crude oil was followed throughout the United States by an average reduction in the wholesale price of gasoline (which was not passed on to the consumer) of 2 cents per gallon. Granting, for the sake of argument, that the difference in the values of our imports and exports of petroleum products, and the favorable trade balance of $390,000,000 created thereby was all profit, even though that profit went to only four or five huge corporations, and keeping in mind that within the last year the price of 36 gravity Mid-Continent crude has been reduced more than one-third (50 cents per barrel), how long would it take at 50 cents per barrel, with a daily consumption in the United States at the present time of upward of 2,500,000 barrels of crude oil, to entirely account for said $390,000,000 favorable trade balance from crude-oil production alone? And let us also ask how long it would take, at 2 cents a gallon (the amount of reduction in the wholesale price of gasoline in recent months) with a daily consumption of 1,250,000 barrels of gasoline, to account a second time for said $390,000,000 of favorable trade balance?

While the argument is made that our exports of petroleum products exceed our imports thereof, we find, upon an analysis of the figures, that, taking into consideration the exports from the Pacific coast, to which there are no imports, or, if any, only a negligible amount, that there are more barrels of petroleum products imported to the Gulf and Atlantic ports than are exported from the same ports.

Again it is stated that there should be no tariff on imports of petroleum products because it would be detrimental to the interests of the consumers, the buyers of gasoline; that the consumers so far outnumber the producers and refiners and those employed in the petroleum industry that their interests are paramount. However, there seems to be little relation between the price of crude oil to the producer in the United States and the price of gasoline and lubricating oils to the consumer. This can be illustrated briefly by referring to the fact that in February, 1926, in 52 representative cities throughout the United States, the average price of gasoline at the filling station, exclusive of tax, was 18.09 cents per gallon, while the average price of crude oil of 36 gravity Baumé during February, 1926, in Oklahoma and Kansas was $2.04 per barrel. The average recovery of gasoline by the refining methods then in use was 35 per cent, or 14.70 gallons per barrel. In 1929, the average price of gasoline at the filling stations in the same cities, exclusive of tax, was 18.39 cents per gallon, while the price of crude oil of 36 gravity Baumé in Kansas and Oklahoma was $1.20, and the recovery of gasoline by improved refining methods had increased to 46 per cent, or 19.32 gallons of gasoline for each barrel of oil. The same relative price schedules obtained throughout the years 1926 and 1929. The price of gasoline to the consumer has not fluctuated in proportion to the price of crude oil.

Cheap imported fuel oil has caused the price of the domestic fuel oil in the refining centers of the Mid-Continent field to fall at times below 50 cents per barrel, thus bringing about a very wasteful utilization of this oil, which might better be saved for higher uses than fuel. This cheap fuel oil, coming into competition with coal, has brought serious distress to the coal industry throughout the country, which industry has been compelled to discharge from employment during the time this condition has prevailed, not less than 50,000 American laborers employed in the mines and in the transportation of coal. The unemployment problem, now receiving such diligent consideration by the adminis-

tration, might be greatly reduced by shutting out imports of cheap fuel oil, allowing the use of coal in many industrial and manufacturing centers, and thus bringing about a reemployment of thousands of miners who are now idle.

If the present program of so-called conservation is continued, and results in the shutting down of producing wells, and the cessation of development and exploration work, the known oil reserves of the United States will become practically valueless. The present owners, unable to hold the same without receiving any income therefrom will be compelled to sell them in a market demoralized because of this program. The purchasers who would be willing to buy under these conditions would be the same corporations who control and monopolize the production and marketing of oil throughout the world outside of the United States. It is acknowledged that there is a world monopoly on oil outside of this country. The markets of the United States are approximately 70 per cent of the markets of the world for petroleum products. If it is desirable that monopoly shall securely fasten its tentacles upon the petroleum industry of the United States, with the same grip it holds upon the remainder of the world, and if it is desirable that the consumers of the United States should ultimately pay the same price for gasoline and other petroleum products that are charged in Europe and other foreign countries, then the so-called program of conservation should be continued, even though it bring utter ruin in its wake to one-fifth of the population of the United States directly, and indirectly and in a lesser degree to the entire country; even though it shall cause an increase in ad valorem taxes in the oil-producing States, to make up for the taxes lost from the gross-production tax on oil and gas; even though its effect on general business, banking, and agriculture, through destruction of consuming power, shall be most serious; even though 20,000 oil producers, individuals, partnerships, and large and small corporations shall be put out of business, and their 800,000 employees and their families compelled to look for work in other lines; and even though the advocates of this policy in reserving the petroleum resources of the United States for future generations shall, after viewing the havoc wrought by their program, have a feeling of righteous accomplishment.

I have never contended that a tariff on oil is a panacea for all the ills of the industry. Were imports entirely eliminated we must still proceed with a sane, orderly program of development and operation of our oil fields, and, by cooperation, balance supply with demand as we have so ably demonstrated we can do—as we have done in the past two years.

I would like to say, in closing, that we should not be discouraged. We have won much support. The whole petroleum industry, the business and commercial interests, the farmers, and the landowners of the oil-producing States now present a solid front in demanding immediate relief and are militantly supporting the program for the exclusion of a foreign oil from the domestic markets, either through the instrumentality of a protective tariff or, if the political exigencies prevent that form of remedy, then by an embargo for a period of years forbidding any importation of oil products whatever.

The directors of the American Petroleum Institute, at its meeting in Chicago, November 10, adopted, by a majority vote, a resolution indorsing, in principle, a tariff on the importation of crude oil and refined products into the United States. On December 5, at the annual meeting of the directors of the General Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association, which association embraces the six States of Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Texas, Louisiana, and Arkansas, and contains in its membership representatives of most of the producing, refining, and marketing interests engaged in business in that district, adopted, with only one dissenting vote, a resolution strongly demanding a tariff on oil and refined products and directing the officers of the association to do everything in their power to secure that form of relief for the industry.

The Rocky Mountain Oil and Gas Association took similar action. All the local oil and gas associations throughout the country have done likewise. The Independent Petroleum Association of America, with membership in every oil-producing State of the Union, is a unit in demanding tariff relief. The chambers of commerce of most of the cities and towns in the oil States have likewise demanded a tariff on oil. A number of State legislatures, which have been in session since the depression in the oil industry has become acute, have memorialized Congress for this relief, the latest one to take such action being the Legislature of California, early this week. Various farm organizations have taken a decided stand in favor of a tariff on oil.

With this united and determined support I feel that Congress and the administration should and will give heed to our prayers and grant us that protection which only they can grant and thus prevent our complete demoralization and ruin. The historical and statistical facts justify, the social and economic conditions demand this relief. Certainly, with all this before them, our Government can find a way.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KETCHAM: At the end of line 23, page 71, strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following:

"*Provided*, That no money herein appropriated shall be available for engineering or economic surveys, or investigations of existing or proposed irrigation projects."

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a point of order on the amendment that it is not germane. I will reserve it if the gentleman wishes to be heard.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, there are, as the gentleman knows, certain studies being carried on under existing legislation, studies of old, established irrigation projects and proposed projects. If there is any money in this bill for that purpose, it would seem to be in this language, "for examinations, surveys, and contingencies of rivers and harbors." If there is no money in this paragraph for that purpose, the amendment proposed by my colleague is not effective. It is not legislation and it would be a nullity; but if there is the possibility under existing legislation of using this appropriation to carry on their irrigation studies, then the limitation proposed is only a limitation and is in order.

Mr. BARBOUR. There is money here for carrying on these surveys that we have been carrying on for the past several years and which were authorized and directed by the Congress in the rivers and harbors act and in the flood control act. These surveys do take into consideration irrigation, as well as power, navigation, and so on.

Mr. CRAMTON. So, as a parliamentary proposition, there is law authorizing them to carry on certain irrigation studies and that money is carried in this paragraph, although it is not conspicuous therein. All that my colleague seeks to do is to put on a limitation to prevent using it for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. TILSON). Can the gentleman from Michigan show that there is any money carried in this paragraph that, without the amendment, could be expended for the purpose forbidden by the amendment?

Mr. CRAMTON. The chairman of the subcommittee has just so stated.

The CHAIRMAN. If it is germane to this paragraph, then the amendment is simply a negative limitation, and the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I invite the careful attention of the members of the committee to this amendment and what it is desired to accomplish by it. I do not think I need to remind you that one of the great problems we have to-day in this country is the problem of farm surpluses. You have just been hearing a story from the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] about the surplus in oil and the difficulties that are accruing to that great industry as a result of this great surplus. Those of us who are familiar with agriculture likewise know the situation there, and we have been doing our very best to limit the expansion of the work in irrigation and reclamation projects, particularly with reference to the new undertakings that promise to bring other areas of land into cultivation.

Mr. CARTER of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. If the gentleman will permit me to proceed just a moment or two, then I shall be pleased to yield.

In this connection may I say that in the introduction of this amendment there is no thought of preventing the completion of irrigation projects already authorized and under construction. The attitude of Congress as to further expansion of irrigation projects in the face of present farm surpluses is clearly understood. Notwithstanding the opposition to such expansion, friends of irrigation have endeavored to find some roundabout way by which surveys of projects can be made and reports filed. When these reports once get into the files it seems almost impossible to prevent further legislation simply because such surveys have been made. The War Department seems to be lending itself to this line of work which it seems clearly to me is wholly outside its proper field of operation, and it is to prevent such action that this amendment is offered.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. Yes.

Mr. BARBOUR. I understand the gentleman's amendment relates to surveys in connection with existing or proposed irrigation districts.

Mr. KETCHAM. The idea particularly is to prevent any expansion of irrigation.

Mr. BARBOUR. But the gentleman is striking at a very vital spot in my State and in the West generally in connection with existing irrigation districts that are short of water at this time; and the surveys that have been carried on by the Corps of Engineers of the Army have been most helpful in getting the facts and data upon which they can do something to save the land that they already have under cultivation.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. There is nothing in the limitation proposed that would prevent any irrigation district being carried on by the bureau established by the Government for the purpose of carrying on irrigation.

Mr. BARBOUR. But I am talking about a private irrigation district. The language of the amendment is " any kind of irrigation district."

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will yield, do I understand that the gentleman from Michigan contends that if the Army engineers are already on the spot doing this work it would not be more economical to have them complete the work rather than magnify the activities of another bureau?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will reserve my statement on the matter.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I would like to find out whether the gentleman knows what percentage of this $60,000,000 might be devoted to the studies or the work he is trying to have discontinued?

Mr. KETCHAM. I want to be sure that none of it is, to be perfectly frank. I do not want to stand in the way of a proper exercise of the duties of the Army engineers, and I think the gentleman understands I am acting in absolute good faith.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Unquestionably the gentleman is acting in good faith; but may I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the Congress in 1925 authorized a study of all the navigable streams of the country and their tributaries, with a view to ascertaining their maximum possible development with respect to power, navigation, and flood control, which only incidentally involves irrigation. This study is not yet completed. It has revealed many facts that have been of great advantage to the country and calculated to add much to the Nation's commerce and its transportation systems. It is a most important work. It will cost, all told, perhaps some seven million dollars plus. There are a few very important projects in various parts of the country on which this study has almost been completed. Now, would the language of the gentleman's amendment prevent a continuation of these studies or of this work? If it would, it would be very serious, and, it seems to me, would be most harmful in its effect.

I know what the gentleman is trying to do, and down in my heart I feel his principle is right, but I am fearful his language will stop the work that is being carried on on these various streams all over the country.

Mr. KETCHAM. It may be that in a few instances some harm may be done by the action contemplated under this amendment, but I go back to the fundamentals involved.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. VESTAL). The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KETCHAM. Going back to the statement I made a moment ago, it seems to me that whatever merit there may be in the suggestion of the gentleman from Alabama that to-day the great question, the much larger question, that should demand our attention is the connection that this amendment has with the great business of agriculture itself. That is the one thing to which it is directed. I sincerely hope that every person here interested in that particular phase will think it over and be glad to give his support to this amendment. Because it does seem to me that the principle we have announced time and time again that you can not accomplish by indirection what you can not accomplish by direction ought to have application here. It is only to restrict the War Department from going into a field unrelated to its river and harbor or flood-control work that the amendment is introduced.

Mr. McFADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. I yield.

Mr. McFADDEN. I came into the Chamber after the gentleman introduced his amendment. I presume it is to stop the further duplication in irrigation projects.

Mr. KETCHAM. Yes; as far as the War Department is concerned.

Mr. McFADDEN. Are they contemplating surveys of the Columbia River Basin project?

Mr. KETCHAM. They are getting under way, and I would be glad to restrict any further survey in that direction.

Mr. McFADDEN. The reason I asked is that I visited there a short time ago and there is a program that at the next session they will strive to bring about legislation for that development. I understand that a fund of $100,000 has been raised for lobbying by the local people to foist this development on Congress and to insure the passage of the Columbia River Basin project.

Mr. KETCHAM. I have not had that particular fact brought to my attention. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I desire to submit some views on this general subject recently published in the Farm Journal of Philadelphia.

It is to this employment of Federal money to further new reclamation schemes at this time to which I object and I can see no essential difference whether it is Uncle Sam's cash in the Reclamation Fund that we take or Uncle Sam's cash in the Treasury. In either case it is money belonging to all the people east and west. Surely it is an injustice to employ the funds belonging in part to each Michigan farmer to increase his competition, decrease his market, and depress his selling prices.

It is a crowning injustice when the Government is asked to step in to finance new projects that private capital will not touch. It should be plain, it seems to me, that the willingness of private capital to invest is the true test of the soundness of the enterprise. Capital is not the timid creature it is sometimes represented. It is venturesome enough at times. And when a reclamation scheme is pronounced too risky for private investors to touch that should be conclusive proof that the enterprise is economically unsound.

I can not escape the conclusion that it is contrary to sound public policy to expand our irrigation program by launching new projects. It is clear to me that it is unjust to taxpayers in general and to the farmers of the country in particular. Furthermore, I am unable to understand how it can be of advantage to more than a small percentage of the most exceptional settlers on the new projects. I have examined at some length the surveys already made of the Columbia Basin project. Here the cost of purchasing, fitting, and equipping an 80-acre farm is estimated at from $7,500 to $15,000 exclusive of cost of water rights. Less than 10 per cent of the settlers seeking such homes have as much as $5,000 to invest. Facing new problems and uncertainties, the chances of even the few are far slimmer than they would be with similar investment in land already available in old established communities.

A word of assurance needs to be given those timid souls among us who see in a suspension of reclamation some dan-

ger to our food supply. Since 1920 there has been a marked decrease in the number of farms and in farm population in the United States. In spite of this, however, production has increased due to increased efficiency in farm work and the rapid mechanization of farm operations. In addition to this many millions of acres of plow land are idle in all sections of the country. Both these factors amply offset the demand of our growing population for foodstuffs.

Early in this article I stated that Congress had thrown some safeguards around these appropriations by providing that new projects must be analyzed and favorably reported upon by the Reclamation Service. That is a precaution of a sort, but it is not, in practice, a very effective one. For some reason it seems to be felt in Congress that if an investigation is once authorized and a favorable report brought in, Congress is under some kind of obligation to proceed with the project. It seems to be the idea that Congress could not have made a mistake in ordering the investigation and the Reclamation Service could not be wrong in recommending it. There is no inherent reason why this should be so, but in practice that is the way it works out. In some way Congress regards the project as having been started when the investigation is made.

The only way to prevent this, it seems to me, is to put down our foot firmly when proposals for new surveys are made. Let us have no more investigations, large or small, promising or unpromising, at least until farming has had a chance to catch up with its present competition.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, how is the time being divided? The opponents of the amendment ought to have something to say about it.

Mr. CRAMTON. I thought that we were changing the customary order, and certainly we are not in a position to shut off debate, for that rests in the hands of my friend from California. My thought is to accomplish the development of facts, and it occurred to me that possibly the gentleman from California would like for me to make my statement before he made his, so that he might get a better understanding of it.

Mr. BARBOUR. I can have no better understanding than I have at the present time. The gentleman's statement will not influence me, but I am willing that the gentleman should make his statement. I think the amendment is uncalled for, and I think I can demonstrate it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Michigan for five minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, my collegue the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM] brought this matter to my attention a few minutes ago. I think what my colleague wants to accomplish, and certainly what I desire to accomplish, is to challenge the attention of Congress to a highly wasteful, extravagant, undesirable duplication of effort. There is no desire to interfere with any desirable project under way. It may be that the suggestion fails to adequately protect everybody's interest. If so, if the House sustains the principle involved of nonduplication of effort, the gentleman from California, before it gets through Congress, will be able to shape up the language to meet their views.

What I want to bring to the attention of the House is what I mentioned before. Last June I made a speech in the House, and I presented certain letters. In early July I brought it to the attention of the Budget and asked them to make an investigation, because, in my judgment, that is one of the real functions of the Budget, to study the activities of various branches of the Government, to the end that there may not be undesirable duplication of effort. I expected that I would have the information to submit to the subcommittee at the hearings.

Mr. CARTER of California. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CRAMTON. I can not yield now. I want to present my statement without interruption. I want to present some facts in an orderly fashion. The Budget referred it to the Bureau of Efficiency, and the first thing I could get out of that bureau was after the hearings were closed before the gentleman's committee. I have a letter this morning from the Director of the Budget stating the matter will be gone into with care.

In the legislation referred to language is adopted that if followed out reasonably is quite proper and perhaps desirable. That is to say, they were authorized in a study of rivers not only to study the needs of navigation and of flood control but also the questions of power development and irrigation. A reasonable exercise of that authority could not be complained of when through knowledge of a certain work they can as an incident of that work make that study; or, if it is essential in order to determine the navigation possibilities the questions of irrigation require consideration, such study should be made. No one objects to their doing that, but here is what they are doing. I call attention to some of the extreme cases, because I want the gentleman from Alabama to join with us and get this thing fixed in the way that it ought to be. They went into the field of the Columbia Basin. Within a week or two after Congress two years ago refused to contribute one-half of the cost of a further field study the Army proceeded to contribute 100 per cent of the cost. In defiance of the action of Congress in refusing 50 per cent, they contributed 100 per cent, amounting to $100,000 or more.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Is not the gentleman fearful that this language will stop the study already undertaken and yet incomplete as to these various rivers?

Mr. CRAMTON. Some of them ought to be stopped, and some of them never should have been commenced.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. This is not a subject that will be settled to-day, but I want gentlemen to think about it. In a letter under date of July 11, 1930, addressed to the Chief of Engineers, General Brown, Doctor Mead, the Commissioner of Reclamation, in appealing to them to get onto a reasonable basis, wrote as follows:

> One of these cooperative investigations carried out in 1923–24 was a study of the lower Platte and tri-county projects along the river from North Platte to Hastings, Nebr. Detailed reports were prepared and have been considered by committees in Congress. Now, the engineers from your Kansas City office have taken up the review of these projects, have copied our reports, made surveys, and are expecting, so I am informed, to review the engineering on economic aspects as presented in our report. This is being done without any conference with the authorities of reclamation work in Washington.

If you want an economic study on the feasibility of an irrigation project, what is the sense of referring it to the Army? Is that the place to go for a real economic study of irrigation, whatever may be the case as to engineering studies? Then he said further:

> The Army field work in itself is understood to be largely supplemental in character, but the preparation of reports and subsequent consideration of construction feasibility is a duplication. In order to acquaint themselves with the work that has gone before, the various engineer officers have equipped themselves at heavy cost with duplicates of reports, maps, and plans on file in our offices.
>
> The difference in resulting conclusions by the two departments will beget confusion and unhealthy impressions by the general public.
>
> Suppose that the Reclamation Bureau, with no background of knowledge of ocean-going commerce or of tides or shipping, should send its representatives to the United States engineer office in San Francisco, proceed to copy plans, estimates, and reports of the harbor improvement of that city, and then work out a scheme for an independent and different development. These irrigationists with no background of knowledge necessary to wise judgment would be in very much the same position with the engineers of the War Department formulating plans for the irrigation and

agricultural development of much of the country now being included in these studies. I am curious to know whether you would regard such activity of the Reclamation Bureau as duplication or worse.

Let me give you one other illustration of the ridiculous extreme to which they are going: They are not only making studies that are necessary and incident to the study of navigation and flood control but they went up into Motana recently with a large force into an area where no one has yet asked for an irrigation project. They sent their engineers in and they made an engineering and an economic study on what is called Musselshell—some creek, and if anybody here knows what it is or where it is I would like to have him tell me.

Mr. LEAVITT rose.

Mr. CRAMTON. Oh, of course, the gentleman from Montana knows, but I did not notice that he was present.

Mr. LEAVITT. It is an area in which there should be constructed an irrigation project for the preservation of existing livestock and a farming settlement.

Mr. CRAMTON. Does it present any great navigation possibilities?

Mr. LEAVITT. No; except in connection with streams below.

Mr. CRAMTON. They have gone in there and developed the plan and are all ready to report to Congress practically their recommendation as to the construction of an irrigation project up in the Musselshell in Montana, far from navigation. What will be the result? First, there is a widespread demand now in the West that instead of these projects being constructed out of the reclamation fund and they repaid by the settlers they be built as other river and harbor works are built—100 per cent at the cost of the Federal Government. That is the first thing. Next, they come in without the proper background of the economic questions involved in irrigation and present a report. The reclamation fund has not the money to-day to build that even if it is recommended, and they were not contemplated for many years to come; and in the meantime this definite report recommending it from the Army is there on file, and fortifying any local demand for early development.

Conditions will greatly change before construction time arrives, and that money is first, a complete waste, whatever is spent in their study; and in the second place, as to economic studies, they do not have any great standing in Congress, Army officers passing on questions of agriculture and economics; and in the third place, it does present all of the complications as to 100 per cent cost by the Government. Now, what we should do is to get an expression by the Congress condemning these unnecessary investigations carried on by the War Department, and that will be accomplished by this amendment if it is agreed to by the committee. Thereafter my friend from California, who is familiar with some aspects of it, will no doubt see that the amendment is amended and modified so as not to hurt anyone.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, this matter has been brought several times before the House of Representatives by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON]. A condition exists that he seems to be much exercised and concerned about, and he is the only one, so far as I know, who has objected, until his colleague came in to-day and offered this amendment.

Now, what is the situation? The Board of Army Engineers has been making surveys for the purpose of determining potential power, navigation, irrigation, and any necessary flood control on these streams. It has been doing that because in two acts of this Congress we have placed that duty upon the Board of Army Engineers. They did not seek it. In the rivers and harbors acts and the flood control act we placed the duty upon them to do this work. If the gentleman from Michigan does not like that—and he is the only one I know of who does not like it—why does he not amend those acts instead of coming here each time an appropriation bill is considered on this floor and getting exercised about the Board of Army Engineers?

His amendment would prohibit the expenditure of any of this money for engineering or economic surveys or investigations of any existing or proposed irrigation projects. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] knows of, but he is not considering this amendment, certain irrigation projects, large private irrigation projects, that were built by the farmers themselves with their own money, and they have not asked the Federal Government for a single dollar.

Those irrigation projects, several in our State and in other parts of the West, pay their own bills. They have not asked the Federal Government for a cent, but they do have a water problem, and the Board of Army Engineers has gone in there in these surveys and they are the first ones, let me say, who have done anything for them in the way of giving assistance. The Board of Army Engineers has done this under the direction we have given in those two acts, and with the money carried in the War Department appropriation bill, and they have made surveys that have been a real help and a real benefit to those farmers who are trying to do something for themselves. The gentleman from Michigan would cut those people off from any assistance under this bill.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. I yield.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I am not at all concerned about any dissension between the Board of Army Engineers and the Reclamation Department.

Mr. BARBOUR. There is none, so far as I know, let me say to the gentleman. The only one who seems to know of any dissension is the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

Mr. McDUFFIE. There is no desire on the part of the engineers to take over the work of Doctor Mead's department.

Mr. BARBOUR. Absolutely none.

Mr. McDUFFIE. But some of these reports, and they are very important, ordered to be made by Congress, are in the making, and I am fearful that under this language they could not proceed to print one that was ready for printing and send their report to Congress.

Mr. BARBOUR. I do not believe they could.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I think it is a dangerous procedure. Nobody has said how much of this fund might be expended for the work that is incidental to flood control, made by the engineers now. Nobody seems to know. It may be a mere pittance, but it is not really a part of their problem, it is true, and yet it is incidental to their problem. The engineers can not give a true and complete picture of any stream without giving some notice to the irrigation projects on that stream.

Mr. BARBOUR. I think the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. McDUFFIE] is absolutely correct.

Dr. Elwood Mead was in my section of the country last year studying this problem for the benefit of these privately owned irrigation districts. Colonel Robbins was the Army engineer who was there making this study of the streams. The information that I received was to the effect that there was the utmost harmony between Colonel Robbins and Doctor Mead.

Mr. PARKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. No; not now.

Mr. PARKS. Just for a question.

Mr. BARBOUR. Very well.

Mr. PARKS. I am in sympathy with the gentleman's position. I am amazed that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] should object to a survey. I want to ask the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR] if there is any Member in this House who has made more surveys and traveled farther and made more investigations than the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] in the last 10 years?

Mr. BARBOUR. Knowing that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] had raised this question and had complained about the Board of Army Engineers before on the floor of the House, when the Board of Army Engineers was before the committee we took some time to ask a few questions about their relations with the Reclamation Service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR] has expired.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Does the gentleman think it is accurate to say that I am the only one interested in this?

Mr. BARBOUR. I say that the gentleman from Michigan is the only one who has objected, so far as I have heard.

Mr. CRAMTON. I have already quoted from Doctor Mead's letter to General Brown, and I have other letters, later ones, to the same effect.

Mr. BARBOUR. Now, let me quote from General Brown to Doctor Mead—not directly to Doctor Mead, but in regard to Doctor Mead. General Brown said, in the hearings at page 149:

General BROWN. I have been to see the chief of the Reclamation Service, in order to avoid any duplication, and explained to him what our general purposes were and told him what we were going to do, what data we were going to get, and explained to him that it would be made available to him, any of it, in case he wanted it, and that as to any data he might have that was applicable to what we proposed to do we would be glad to get without doing work ourselves.

Mr. BARBOUR. And they have cooperated in this work?

General BROWN. They have cooperated in this work; yes. He was perfectly agreeable, and there is a perfect understanding, so far as I know, between the Reclamation Service and the Corps of Engineers on that basis.

The idea of full and complete cooperation is there, to the effect that when we are ordered to do something by Congress we are going to do it, and what he does not get we will get, and what he has we will make use of.

Mr. BARBOUR. There is no dissension?

General BROWN. None whatever.

Mr. BARBOUR. Or pulling back between the two departments in reference to that work?

General BROWN. There is none whatever. He understands what we are doing. We agree with him that if there is anything he has to say in reference to our reports he is at liberty to say it, and we will attach that to the reports.

Then it was called to General Brown's attention that there had been some criticism on the floor about this relationship between the Army engineers and the Reclamation Service. General Brown said:

I noticed the account of that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Before that had happened I had made a personal call on the chief of the Reclamation Service and explained the matter to him and told him what we desired to do in the way of cooperation, in that we had no desire whatever to create any duplication, and I thought there was a perfect understanding. Since that time I have seen them again, and we have given him full information as to what we were doing so he could take advantage of it, or, if he had anything that would be of advantage to us, we could use any part of it.

Then this question was asked:

Then, as far as the Director of the Reclamation Service is concerned, there is a perfect understanding?

And General Brown said:

There is a perfect understanding, I believe.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. I yield.

Mr. KETCHAM. Did the questioning of General Brown develop to what extent the Army engineers had gone into a survey of irrigation projects?

Mr. BARBOUR. They have been directed by Congress to make those surveys. General Brown says there is certain information in the hands of the Reclamation Service. Now, instead of going out and doing that work over again, they went to the Reclamation Service and said, "We want to cooperate with you. If you have anything we can make use of turn it over to us, so we will not do the work over again, and anything we get we will turn over to you."

Mr. KETCHAM. To be perfectly plain and frank now, is there any evidence developed anywhere that General Brown went out and undertook surveys, or that there was any contemplation that he would, in areas where the action of the Congress had clearly indicated it did not propose to have such surveys made by another department?

Mr. BARBOUR. I never heard of such a thing.

Mr. KETCHAM. Does the gentleman think that is true or is not true?

Mr. BARBOUR. I have no information whatever.

Mr. KETCHAM. If that were true, the gentleman would be opposed to it?

Mr. BARBOUR. Absolutely.

Mr. KETCHAM. Then the gentleman should be in favor of this amendment.

Mr. BARBOUR. I am opposed to this amendment. This amendment goes further than that and strikes at those privately owned irrigation districts which are trying to do something for themselves, and the only help they have had, so far as I know, is this help from the Board of Army Engineers in these surveys.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Congress refused to vote to authorize half the expense by the Federal Government in the Columbia Basin, and within two weeks of that refusal they took 100 per cent out of their fund. Is not that what the gentleman refers to?

Mr. BARBOUR. I am not referring to that at all. I am referring to the effect it will have on certain irrigation districts if this amendment is adopted. I do not think any Member of this House wants to do anything of that kind to a privately owned irrigation district; districts that are endeavoring to pay their own bills and have had a little help from the Board of Army Engineers. [Applause.]

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I dislike especially to disagree with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON]. He is undoubtedly the most valuable friend of reclamation in the House, but I rise in opposition to the amendment. I do so particularly because the Musselshell project in Montana was referred to by the gentleman from Michigan, and I am greatly interested in its development. He used that project and situation and referred to it as an illustration of why this amendment should be adopted. I wish to use the same project and situation as a reason why the amendment should not be adopted.

I have on my desk to-day quotations from a letter of the Commissioner of Reclamation in reply to a request that the economic study of that project be made by the Reclamation Service. In reply to that request the statement was made that there was a report prepared, I think, in 1902 or 1903, in which it was stated that a suitable reservoir site had not been discovered. Mr. Chairman, during this last fall I went over that project personally and visited two adequate reservoir sites. That proves to me conclusively that that old information of almost 30 years ago is not complete and does not meet the present situation.

But there is a cogent reason why that study can not be expected at this time by the Reclamation Service. That reason is that they do not now have in their possession the funds necessary to carry on this and various other studies similar to this one on the Musselshell River and like those referred to by the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR]. There is a lack of money in the reclamation fund for that purpose. Now, under this provision in this Army bill, while the flood-control studies are being made and while the navigation studies are being made, that other needed information can be at least partly also gathered. We shall thus be advancing these irrigation projects needed as a part of the development of the western country.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is it not true that not only are the appropriations for investigations by the Reclamation Service limited but also that the amount of money—because the projects have failed to pay the charges due—in the fund has become so limited that not only can they not take on the gentleman's project as a new project but they can not continue their established 10-year program?

Mr. LEAVITT. I am very sorry to say there does exist that shortage of money, but at the same time that very fact is an added reason for allowing this work to go forward under this Army appropriation.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is the gentleman aware that there is a definite demand in some quarters that $5,000,000 be taken out of the Federal Treasury to advance to the reclamation fund in order to carry on the existing program?

Mr. LEAVITT. That has not been advanced to Congress in any bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. But such a demand has been made?

Mr. LEAVITT. That suggestion has been made, but there is no demand of that kind before the Congress.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is the gentleman aware of the demand that has developed somewhere in the West and definitely expressed in some quarters that as a result of these Army studies these projects should be built not by the Reclamation Service but by the Corps of Engineers, and that they ought to be paid for out of Federal funds as river and harbor projects are paid for?

Mr. LEAVITT. That has not come to my attention.

Mr. CRAMTON. I have that evidence.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I will say to the gentleman that that will not be done soon by this Congress, in my judgment.

Mr. LEAVITT. I have stated that that has not come to my attention, but it would not surprise me to have almost any kind of proposal grow up in the minds of the interested people.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Why, certainly.

Mr. LEAVITT. But I do not expect that to be soon done by the Congress, based on my knowledge of how things are accomplished here and what is possible. At the same time, I will say that with the shortage of reclamation funds many of these things that would ordinarily be fully justified out of the reclamation fund unfortunately can not be done just at this time from that source.

The gathering together of this information, however, may make evident the feasibility of proposed projects, even if it proves necessary ultimately to finance some of them under State laws or otherwise. In any event the gathering of this information is valuable and should not be stopped through the adoption of this amendment, because, let me say again, it can not be carried forward now under the Reclamation Service, because the funds are not available. There surely can not be any duplication of work which can not be done except under this one Army appropriation.

Mr. McFADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVITT. I yield.

Mr. McFADDEN. Will the gentleman explain to the committee why this examination of Musselshell Creek in Montana was started at this time? What were the reasons for that?

Mr. LEAVITT. Of course I and others requested it, but it was undertaken under the authority and direction of this Congress in connection with studies of flood control and navigation. The Musselshell is a tributary that becomes ultimately a part of the great Missouri and Mississippi River system. They are carrying on a complete study to develop the entire situation in that drainage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment again reported?

The Clerk again reported the Ketcham amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. TILSON). The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's request comes too late.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute to withdraw an objection I recently made to the request of a Member.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for one minute.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, a further explanation of the situation has convinced me that my objection, although possibly fundamentally right, might do an injustice to a great many Members who desire information that can only be obtained by them through the columns of the RECORD. So without compromising my principle or my practice in any way, I withdraw my objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I renew my request, inasmuch as the gentleman from Massachusetts has withdrawn his objection, to incorporate as an extension of my remarks made to-day, the statement of Mr. Wirt Franklin, president of the Independent Oil Producers of Oklahoma, made at a meeting in the caucus room of the House Office Building this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

(The statement occurs in connection with the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] previously made.)

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and will only detain the committee a moment.

I want to get some information from the chairman of the subcommittee. What is the total amount that will be availfor river and harbor work for the fiscal year 1932, including the emergency appropriation made before the holidays? Is it $82,500,000 or $71,000,000?

Mr. BARBOUR. Eighty-two million five hundred thousand dollars—$60,000,000 here and $22,500,000 in the emergency bill.

Mr. McDUFFIE. But, as the gentleman will doubtless recall, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] said when that bill was under consideration that there was $11,000,000 duplicated, and I remember asking the question on the floor and I would like to read the gentleman his answer.

Mr. BARBOUR. I think I can explain that.

Mr. McDUFFIE. The gentleman's answer was not altogether clear to me, but I would judge it means that $71,000,000 would be available as the total amount for 1932 instead of $82,500,000.

Mr. BARBOUR. In the emergency bill and in these estimates there were certain projects, the money for which overlapped, but we carry in this bill $60,000,000 and in the emergency bill $22,500,000; and General Brown said that there would not be any duplication in the work but that this money would enable him to speed up the work and do work that he otherwise could not have done, because there is just that much more money that he has in the appropriations.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Let me read just this short paragraph. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] said:

> This twenty-two and a half million dollars is just that much more than they would have gotten if it were not for this bill. The $11,000,000 is not duplication, but just that much more money for the same projects between this bill and the regular bill.

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. McDUFFIE. So there is just $11,000,000 more for the same projects?

Mr. BARBOUR. No; $22,500,000 more.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will permit, I remember the discussion in the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations when the emergency bill was before that committee——

Mr. McDUFFIE. If the gentleman from Michigan and the chairman of the committee feel sure that the amount is

$82,500,000, I am very happy, and I have no desire to interfere with the program.

Mr. CRAMTON. Since neither appropriation is limited to any particular projects and it is all available for any work authorized by law, of course, the sum total is available, and while the $22,500,000 may take care of $11,000,000 that would have been in this bill, that releases $11,000,000 out of this amount to go further than was otherwise planned.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made by including an article that I have prepared in support on the subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made in the RECORD, and also to include some correspondence.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Emergency fund for flood control on tributaries of Mississippi River: For rescue work and for repair or maintenance of any flood-control work on any tributaries of the Mississippi River threatened or destroyed by flood, in accordance with section 7 of flood control act, approved May 15, 1928 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 33, sec. 702g), $400,000.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have an interesting letter here from the Director of the Census in reference to the unemployment census, which I believe will be of interest to every member of the committee, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the Bureau of the Census is taking a census of the unemployed in several cities of the United States to check up the unemployment situation in comparison with the situation of to-day with that of last April. The census starts to-day, I believe.

In the meantime many cities have provided for temporary employment. In other words, they give employment for three days in the week instead of giving relief money direct. The temporary relief employment is a cover only to charitable aid. It is not productive or gainful employment.

The unemployment situation has created in many cities the apple-peddling system. Now, I want to call the attention of the House that in this census that started to-day the Census Bureau is going to count the unemployed men selling apples as gainfully employed. They are going to count the men that are receiving this little relief—I do not want to use the word charity, but it is charity—this little relief as a gainful employment.

Now, such a census will not be of much aid to us in getting an accurate picture of the real unemployment situation in these cities.

Mr. ABERNETHY. It may aid the Red Cross.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. What we want is an actual picture of the unemployment situation. We can not give instructions to the supervisors. If time permitted, I would ask this House to instruct the Director of the Census by resolution to cause an accurate and intelligent enumeration of the unemployed to be made. I do not know what we can do to get an accurate, intelligent census, but I appeal to every Member of the House who is interested in having an intelligent census of the unemployment situation, to call this matter to the attention of the Census Bureau, so that these men receiving temporary relief and selling apples shall not be counted as men gainfully employed, but properly classified as able and willing to work but unemployed.

Mr. PARKS. What difference does it make whether there are 5,000,000 or 10,000,000 men out of employment unless they are going to do something for them?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Well, if there are 5,000,000 men or 10,000,000 men unemployed we ought to know it. It seems to me it is an idle gesture, if we are going to take an unemployment census to check up the conditions now as compared to last April, that any such system as I have described be followed.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may put into the RECORD at this place a letter that I received from the Director of the Census, such as I have described.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS,
Washington, January 13, 1931.

Hon. F. H. LAGUARDIA,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LAGUARDIA: I have received your letter of January 10 relative to the question of the classification in the census of unemployment of men who are receiving relief employment of three days a week paid from charitable funds and men selling apples as a makeshift occupation.

The question of what persons should be included in the census of unemployment received very careful consideration when the census was taken last April. We found that there was no well-established or generally accepted definition of the term "unemployed," and we realized that any general definition would be difficult to apply consistently under the practical limitations of census taking. It was necessary to have some test that could be readily applied. The best practical solution of the problem seemed to be to obtain a record for every person who usually followed a gainful occupation and for any reason, whether on account of sickness, disability, inability to find work, or disinclination to work, was not actually working at the time of the census. Accordingly the instructions issued to the enumerator were to make an entry on the unemployment schedule for every gainful worker who was not at work on the day preceding the enumerator's visit, or on the last previous working day in case the preceding day was not a regular working day. Other questions were included to develop the reasons why the person was not working and how long he had been without work.

It is necessary that the results of this special census about to be taken should be comparable with the census taken last April if we are to have a correct index of the trend of unemployment since that time. It was decided, therefore, that the instructions, definitions, and schedules of inquiries used at this census should be identical with those used in the earlier census. Therefore the enumerators were instructed "to enter on the schedule the name of every gainful worker who was not at work on the last regular working day" preceding the enumerator's visit. But he is not to include any person who is working at a gainful—that is, money-earning—occupation without regard to whether that occupation is permanent or only temporary. This, I believe, is the only workable principle on which a satisfactory census could be taken, and in accordance with that principle we ruled that people engaged in selling apples, either as a temporary or a permanent occupation, are actually working at a gainful—that is, a money-earning—occupation at the time the census is being taken, and therefore are not to be returned on the unemployment schedule.

Very truly yours,

W. M. STEUART, *Director.*

The Clerk read as follows:

Flood control, Sacramento River, Calif.: For prosecuting work of flood control in accordance with the provisions of the flood control act approved March 1, 1917 (U. S. C., title 33, sec. 703), as modified by the flood control act approved May 15, 1928 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 33, sec. 704), $1,000,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I have examined the hearings, and find there is an actual expenditure for the Sacramento of $400,000, of which $200,000 is available, but there is nothing in the hearings to show the actual expenditures. This is the same amount appropriated last year. Has the gentleman any private information how the fund is expended?

The hearings show that prior to the flood control act of 1928, the State and local authorities were contributing two-thirds, and since then the ratio has been changed so that the Federal Government is contributing one-half and the State one-half.

Mr. BARBOUR. That was changed in the flood control act of May 15, 1928. My understanding is that the total amount the Federal Government will be called upon to contribute under that act is $17,600,000, and it is being appropriated now at the rate of $1,000,000 a year. The project is now about 50 per cent completed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of the $17,600,000, how much up to the present time has been appropriated?

Mr. BARBOUR. The project is about one-half completed. This is the third million dollars that has been appropriated under the latest enactment.

Mr. STAFFORD. We have been appropriating for a long time for this work. The limit of appropriation of $17,600,000 is not fixed in that act?

Mr. BARBOUR. That was superseded by the flood control act, which made a new arrangement. In 1925 we appropriated $500,000, and in 1926 $550,000, in 1929 $400,000, and in 1930 we came in under the new act.

Mr. CARTER of California. Under this new act does not the Federal Government contribute one-third and the State of California one-third and the local interests one-third?

Mr. BARBOUR. As I understand it, the State pays one-half of the cost of the levee, and some of the control work, furnishing rights of way, and the United States pays half of the channel improvement and control, and for one-half of the levee.

Mr. STAFFORD. The statement of General Pillsbury in the hearings is explicit, in answer to the direct question repeated several times by the chairman of the committee, Mr. BARBOUR, that the State contributes only one-half and the National Government one-half.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JAMES], is absent from the city on official business. He suggested to me the advisability of letting the RECORD show that the Committee on Military Affairs is aware that there are certain provisions in the bill that are not predicated upon authorizations. The subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs has been very earnest in its efforts to insist that there shall be previous authorizations, but, of course, there are many activities that have been carried for so long without any fundamental authorization that it would be unfair and unwise to make the point of order even if it would lie. There are also some provisions to which the point of order would lie that we think ought to continue in the bill. For the purposes of the RECORD we desire to show that on page 20, line 21, there is no authorization, but that there is a bill pending, H. R. 2671, to constitute authorization; also on page 20, line 21, the bill H. R. 2744 is pending for the purpose of constituting authorization, and the same is true in respect to the following places and bills: Page 21, line 15, H. R. 2967; page 27, line 9, H. R. 4193; page 28, line 17, H. R. 4196; page 34, line 4, H. R. 12202; page 37, line 7, H. R. 2678; page 39, line 1, H. R. 4200; page 39, line 17, H. R. 4195; page 41, line 23, H. R. 10372; page 48, line 9, H. R. 2676; page 54, line 17, H. R. 3147; page 57, line 27, H. R. 2900; page 62, line 2, H. R. 2675.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Have those bills been introduced in this Congress or have they been pending for some time?

Mr. McSWAIN. They have been introduced in this Congress. The subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Military Affairs understand it. It is our intention and desire whenever we have a day to seek to have these bills acted upon.

The Clerk read as follows:

For maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal: Salary of the governor, $10,000; purchase, inspection, delivery, handling, and storing of materials, supplies, and equipment for issue to all departments of the Panama Canal, the Panama Railroad, other branches of the United States Government, and for authorized sales; payment in lump sums of not exceeding the amounts authorized by the injury compensation act approved September 7, 1916 (U. S. C. title 5, sec. 793), to alien cripples who are now a charge upon the Panama Canal by reason of injuries sustained while employed in the construction of the Panama Canal; in all, $9,359,808, including $1,000,000 for continuing the construction of the Madden Dam across the Chagres River at Alhajuela for the storage of water for use in the maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, together with a hydroelectric plant, roadways, and such other work as in the judgment of the Governor of the Panama Canal may be necessary, to cost in the aggregate not to exceed $15,500,000, and including $500,000 for completing the construction of a ferry and highway near the Pacific entrance of the Panama Canal as authorized by the act approved May 27, 1930; together with all moneys arising from the conduct of business operations authorized by the Panama Canal act: *Provided*, That in addition to the amount herein appropriated, the Governor of the Panama Canal is authorized to enter into contracts for continuing the construction of the Madden Dam and accessories, as herein specified, to an amount not to exceed $11,250,000.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of calling attention to an amendment adopted yesterday or the day before, which appears on page 2105 of the RECORD. That amendment provides:

None of the appropriations in this act shall be available for the purchase for use within the continental limits of the United States of any raw materials not produced within the continental limits of the United States or any articles or supplies containing materials or manufactured of materials not produced within the continental limits of the United States, except (1) articles produced or supplies purchased for experimental purposes; (2) crude rubber and components of ammunition or of mixed metals not procurable within the United States; and (3) as may be authorized expressly by law.

I fully approve of having the War Department buy raw materials in the United States; but it seems to me that we are running into a world of trouble by requiring them to have raw materials in manufactured goods bought in the United States, or to show that they are. For instance, take this book, or this rug, or these chairs. It is almost impossible to determine after the article is manufactured whether the raw materials that entered into it were produced here or elsewhere. I fear that this will cause a great deal of trouble. I call the attention of the committee to this for the purpose of giving notice that when it comes up in the House I am going to ask for a special vote upon it and a reconsideration of it, with the idea that next year or some time later something may be worked out that will require the purchase of raw materials without the confusion of having to ascertain whether the raw materials in manufactured goods are produced in the United States. As it is now, with this amendment it seems to me that it will cause a great deal of trouble.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Does not the gentleman think the War Department can work out some simple rule for handling that situation without any trouble? It does seem that the language is not sufficiently involved or so restrictive that it can not be handled and administered properly. I do not think there is the least trouble about it, and I think if the gentleman will consider it from that angle he will have a different attitude toward it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice from a reading of the amendment that the language is positive and mandatory, that no article shall be purchased where it contains any raw material not produced within the continental limits of the United States. They would not be able to purchase a newspaper, because any number of newspapers contain sulphite pulp that is made abroad.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. That is the danger of it and it seems to me this should go over until next year and something could be worked out that would enable the War Department to properly handle the matter.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment for the purpose of calling attention to one fact. I had intended calling attention to the

fact that the paragraph at the bottom of page 72 and the top of page 73 is substantially the same as the amendment adopted the other day known as the Taber amendment at another place in the bill as a substitute to the Collins amendment. Should not this language, which is not as broad, be stricken from this part of the bill?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes. That was stricken out in the whole Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. STAFFORD. I beg the gentleman's pardon, I have the committee print.

Mr. BARBOUR. The whole committee struck it out and then it went in again as the Taber amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. It was the judgment of the full committee that no inane provision like this should be incorporated?

Mr. TABER. No. The Secretary of War sent a letter up there that morning and the committee did not have a chance to thoroughly digest that letter and the committee struck it out, but when it was fully considered, it was put in again.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the period of digestion on the part of the committee on matters that come before it?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. From the War Department, one second.

Mr. STAFFORD. But the committee did strike it out regardless of the period of digestion?

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the amendment as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARBOUR: Page 75, line 14, strike out the semicolon and insert a period.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 15593) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any of the amendments?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the amendment appearing on page 1237 of the RECORD, known as the Taber amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? [After a pause.] If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment, substitute by Mr. TABER, page 25, line 25: Insert the following: "None of the appropriations in this act shall be available for the purchase for use within the limits of the United States of any raw materials not produced within the limits of the United States or any articles or supplies containing materials or manufactured of materials not produced within the limits of the United States, except (1) articles produced or supplies purchased for experimental purposes; (2) crude rubber and components of ammunition or of mixed metals not procurable within the United States; and (3) as may be authorized expressly by law."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill, and I offer the following motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York offers a motion to recommit, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion by Mr. LAGUARDIA: I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 55, line 25, before the period insert:

"*Provided further*, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for any expense incident to any form of military instruction or training in high schools which require or compel students to undergo any form of military instruction or training."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LAGUARDIA) there were—ayes 11, noes 92.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-five Members are present, not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 59, nays 271, not voting 101, as follows:

[Roll No. 16]

YEAS—59

Box	Dowell	Kading	Rankin
Brand, Ohio	Evans, Mont.	Ketcham	Robinson
Burtness	Frear	Kvale	Romjue
Busby	Goldsborough	LaGuardia	Sabath
Cannon	Greenwood	Ludlow	Schafer, Wis.
Christgau	Hall, N. Dak.	Mead	Selvig
Christopherson	Halsey	Mooney	Short, Mo.
Cochran, Mo.	Hill, Wash.	Morehead	Sinclair
Collins	Hope	Morgan	Sparks
Cooper, Wis.	Howard	Nelson, Mo.	Sproul, Kans.
Cox	Huddleston	Nelson, Wis.	Stafford
Crosser	Hudson	Palmisano	Strong, Kans.
Davis	Hull, Morton D.	Parks	Welsh, Pa.
Dickinson	Hull, Wis.	Peavey	Williamson
Dominick	Jones, Tex.	Rainey, Henry T.	

NAYS—271

Abernethy	Campbell, Iowa.	Doxey	Graham
Ackerman	Campbell, Pa.	Drane	Granfield
Adkins	Carter, Calif.	Drewry	Green
Allen	Carter, Wyo.	Driver	Gregory
Allgood	Cartwright	Dunbar	Griffin
Andrew	Chalmers	Dyer	Guyer
Arentz	Chindblom	Eaton, Colo.	Hadley
Arnold	Chiperfield	Edwards	Hall, Ill.
Aswell	Clague	Elliott	Hall, Ind.
Ayres	Clark, Md.	Ellis	Hall, Miss.
Bacon	Clark, N. C.	Englebright	Hancock, N. Y.
Bankhead	Clarke, N. Y.	Erk	Hancock, N. C.
Barbour	Cochran, Pa.	Eslick	Hardy
Beedy	Cole	Estep	Hare
Beers	Collier	Evans, Calif.	Hartley
Black	Colton	Finley	Hastings
Bland	Condon	Fisher	Hess
Blanton	Cooke	Fitzgerald	Hickey
Bloom	Cooper, Ohio	Foss	Hill, Ala.
Bohn	Cooper, Tenn.	Free	Hoch
Bolton	Coyle	Freeman	Hogg, Ind.
Bowman	Crail	Fuller	Hogg, W. Va.
Boylan	Cramton	Gambrill	Hooper
Brand, Ga.	Crisp	Garber, Okla.	Hopkins
Briggs	Cross	Garber, Va.	Houston, Del.
Brigham	Crowther	Garner	Hull, William E.
Britten	Dallinger	Gasque	Igoe
Browning	Darrow	Gibson	Irwin
Brumm	Davenport	Gifford	James, N. C.
Buchanan	Denison	Glover	Jeffers
Burdick	De Priest	Golder	Jenkins
Butler	DeRouen	Goodwin	Johnson, Ill.
Byrns	Douglas, Ariz.	Goss	Johnson, Nebr.

Johnson, Okla.	McMillan	Ragon	Taylor, Colo.
Johnson, Tex.	McReynolds	Ramey, Frank M.	Temple
Johnston, Mo.	McSwain	Ramseyer	Thatcher
Jonas, N. C.	Maas	Ramspeck	Thurston
Kahn	Magrady	Ransley	Tilson
Kelly	Manlove	Reed, N. Y.	Timberlake
Kendall, Ky.	Mapes	Reilly	Tinkham
Kendall, Pa.	Martin	Rich	Treadway
Kinzer	Merritt	Rogers	Turpin
Knutson	Michener	Rutherford	Vestal
Kopp	Miller	Sanders, N. Y.	Vincent, Mich.
Korell	Milligan	Sanders, Tex.	Vinson, Ga.
Kurtz	Montague	Sandlin	Wainwright
Lambertson	Moore, Ky.	Seger	Walker
Lanham	Moore, Ohio	Seiberling	Wason
Lankford, Ga.	Mouser	Shaffer, Va.	Watres
Lankford, Va.	Murphy	Shott, W. Va.	Watson
Larsen	Nelson, Me.	Shreve	Welch, Calif.
Lea	Newhall	Sloan	White
Leavitt	Niedringhaus	Smith, Idaho	Whitehead
Leech	Nolan	Snell	Whitley
Lehlbach	O'Connor, Okla.	Snow	Whittington
Letts	Oldfield	Somers, N. Y.	Wigglesworth
Linthicum	Oliver, Ala.	Speaks	Wilson
Loofbourow	Owen	Spearing	Wingo
Lozier	Palmer	Sproul, Ill.	Wolfenden
Luce	Patman	Stalker	Wolverton, W. Va.
McClintic, Okla.	Patterson	Strong, Pa.	Woodruff
McClintock, Ohio	Perkins	Summers, Wash.	Woodrum
McCormack, Mass.	Pittenger	Sumners, Tex.	Wright
McDuffie	Pratt, Harcourt J.	Swanson	Wurzbach
McFadden	Pratt, Ruth	Swick	Wyant
McKeown	Pritchard	Swing	Yates
McLaughlin	Purnell	Taber	Yon
McLeod	Quin	Tarver	

NOT VOTING—101

Aldrich	Dickstein	Johnson, Wash.	Rowbottom
Almon	Dorsey	Kearns	Schneider
Andresen	Doughton	Kemp	Sears
Auf der Heide	Douglass, Mass.	Kennedy	Simmons
Bacharach	Doutrich	Kerr	Simms
Bachmann	Doyle	Kiefner	Sirovich
Baird	Eaton, N. J.	Kunz	Smith, W. Va.
Beck	Esterly	Langley	Steagall
Bell	Fenn	Lindsay	Stevenson
Blackburn	Fish	McCormick, Ill.	Stobbs
Browne	Fitzpatrick	Mansfield	Stone
Brunner	Fort	Menges	Sullivan, N. Y.
Buckbee	French	Michaelson	Sullivan, Pa.
Cable	Fulmer	Montet	Taylor, Tenn.
Canfield	Garrett	Moore, Va.	Thompson
Carley	Gavagan	Norton	Tucker
Celler	Hale	O'Connor, La.	Underhill
Chase	Haugen	O'Connor, N. Y.	Underwood
Clancy	Hawley	Oliver, N. Y.	Warren
Connery	Hoffman	Parker	Williams
Connolly	Holaday	Parsons	Wolverton, N. J.
Corning	Hudspeth	Pou	Wood
Craddock	Hull, Tenn.	Prall	Zihlman
Culkin	James, Mich.	Rayburn	
Cullen	Johnson, Ind.	Reece	
Dempsey	Johnson, S. Dak.	Reid, Ill.	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Browne (for) with Mr. Johnson of South Dakota (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Hawley with Mr. Cullen.
Mr. Connolly with Mr. Oliver of New York.
Mr. Reid of Illinois with Mr. Doughton.
Mr. Menges with Mr. Gavagan.
Mr. James of Michigan with Mr. Tucker.
Mr. Eaton of New Jersey with Mr. Corning.
Mr. Bacharach with Mr. Moore of Virginia.
Mr. Taylor of Tennessee with Mr. Fulmer.
Mr. French with Mr. Brunner.
Mr. Underhill with Mr. Garrett.
Mr. Wood with Mr. Almon.
Mr. Fenn with Mr. Rayburn.
Mr. Johnson of Washington with Mr. Lindsay.
Mr. Stobbs with Mr. Prall.
Mr. Buckbee with Mr. Montet.
Mr. Reece with Mr. Sirovich.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Steagall.
Mr. Haugen with Mr. Warren.
Mr. Sullivan of Pennsylvania with Mr. Sullivan of New York.
Mr. Fort with Mr. Williams.
Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey with Mr. Doyle.
Mr. Chase with Mr. O'Connor of Louisiana.
Mr. Aldrich with Mr. Pou.
Mr. Simmons with Mr. Kemp.
Mr. Hoffman with Mr. Dickstein.
Mr. Beck with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Kiefner with Mrs. Norton.
Mr. Cable with Mr. O'Connor of New York.
Mr. Doutrich with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. Stone with Mr. Underwood.
Mr. Culkin with Mr. Smith of West Virginia.
Mr. Johnson of Indiana with Mr. Kerr.
Mr. Clancy with Mr. Kunz.
Mr. Holaday with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Esterly with Mr. Carley.
Mr. Parker with Mr. Dorsey.
Mr. Zihlman with Mr. Hudspeth.
Mr. Schneider with Mr. Connery.
Mr. Andresen with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Fish with Mr. Hull of Tennessee.
Mr. Simms with Mr. Mansfield.
Mr. Hale with Mr. Kennedy.
Mr. Craddock with Mr. Fitzpatrick.
Mrs. McCormick of Illinois with Mr. Douglass of Massachusetts.
Mr. Kearns with Mr. Auf der Heide.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. BARBOUR, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WARREN (at the request of Mr. HANCOCK of North Carolina), for to-day, on account of illness.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 447. Joint resolution making an appropriation to carry out the provisions of the public resolution entitled "Joint resolution for the relief of farmers in the drought and/or storm stricken areas of the United States," approved December 20, 1930.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2865. An act granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of Wyoming and Idaho with respect to the boundary line between said States.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 447. Joint resolution making an appropriation to carry out the provisions of the public resolution entitled "Joint resolution for the relief of farmers in the drought and/or storm stricken areas of the United States," approved December 20, 1930.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, January 16, 1931, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Friday, January 16, 1931, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10.30 a. m.)

District of Columbia appropriation bill.
Legislative appropriation bill.
Navy Department appropriation bill.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

(10 a. m.)

Oil shale lands.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

777. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to increase the limits of cost of construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

778. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation pertaining to the legislative establishment under the Architect of the Capitol for the fiscal year 1932 in the sum of $2,833 (H. Doc. No. 718); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

779. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill authorizing an appropriation for the erection of a memorial to the officers and men of the United States Navy who lost their lives as the result of a boiler explosion that totally destroyed the U. S. S. *Tulip* near St. Inigoes Bay, Md., on November 11, 1864, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Library.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 5295. An act authorizing an additional per capita payment to the Shoshone and Arapahoe Indians; without amendment (Rept. No. 2274). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LETTS: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 13528. A bill providing for payment of $100 to each enrolled Chippewa Indian of Minnesota from the funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 2275). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FULLER: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 13249. A bill to authorize the acceptance of a tract of land adjoining Hot Springs National Park, Ark., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2276). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 10515. A bill to ratify certain leases with the Seneca Nation of Indians; with amendment (Rept. No. 2278). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 14055. A bill to make permanent certain temporary judgeships; with amendment (Rept. No. 2279). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LUCE: Committee on the Library. H. R. 15931. A bill to provide for the relocation of statue of Gen. John A. Rawlins; without amendment (Rept. No. 2280). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LUCE: Committee on the Library. H. R. 16078. A bill to amend the act approved June 2, 1930, providing for a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt for his leadership in the cause of forest conservation; with amendment (Rept. No. 2281). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 4425. An act to amend section 284 of the Judicial Code of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2282). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. RANSLEY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 10003. A bill to authorize full settlement for professional services rendered to an officer of the United States Army; with amendment (Rept. No. 2272). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 13856. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay E. C. Sampson, of Billings, Mont., for services rendered the Crow Tribe of Indians; with amendment (Rept. No. 2273). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EATON of Colorado: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 14491. A bill for the relief of J. N. Gordon; without amendment (Rept. No. 2277). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOHN: A bill (H. R. 16205) authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of the Crooked and Indian Rivers, Mich.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16206) providing for a preliminary examination and survey of the harbor at Naubinway, Mackinac County, Mich.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 16207) to prohibit the recovery of any indebtedness to the United States from either the principal or the interest due and payable to any depositor from the military or naval service whose savings were intrusted to the Government under provisions of existing law; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MORTON D. HULL: A bill (H. R. 16208) to procure and erect in the city of Washington the group of statuary known as The Indian Buffalo Hunt; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MILLIGAN: A bill (H. R. 16209) to amend paragraph (1), section 201, World War veterans' act, 1924; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SINCLAIR: A bill (H. R. 16210) to provide for the conducting of livestock breeding, growing, and feeding experiments in connection with the Dickinson Field Station at Dickinson, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JAMES of Michigan (at request of the War Department): A bill (H. R. 16211) to authorize the attendance of personnel and animals of the Regular Army as participants in the Tenth Olympic Games; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 16212) providing for examination and survey of Lake River, Wash.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16213) to provide for distribution of tribal funds of the Puyallup Indians of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. OLIVER of New York: A bill (H. R. 16214) granting retirement to certain former employees of the Treasury Department; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 16215) authorizing the sale of surplus power developed under the Grand Valley reclamation project, Colorado; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 16216) to increase the limit of cost of construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H. R. 16217) to amend section 32 of the act of Congress approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm loan act, but adding thereto a section to be known as section 32–A; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 16218) to amend subsection (a) of section 1 of an act entitled "An act for the acquisition, establishment, and development of the George Washington Memorial Parkway along the Potomac from Mount Vernon and Fort Washington to the Great Falls, and to provide for the acquisition of lands in the District of Columbia and the States of Maryland and Virginia requisite to the comprehensive park, parkway, and playground system of the National Capital," approved May 29, 1930; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 16219) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. REED of New York: Resolution (H. Res. 335) for the consideration of H. R. 12901 to extend the provisions of certain laws relating to vocational education and civilian rehabilitation to Porto Rico; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 336) for the consideration of S. 2113 to aid in effectuating the purposes of the Federal laws for promotion of vocational agriculture; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CRISP: Resolution (H. Res. 337) to amend Rule II by adding two new paragraphs; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 338) to amend paragraph 4 of Rule XIII; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 339) to amend Rule XXVII, providing a discharge rule; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WAINRIGHT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 467) to provide for the erection of a suitable memorial to the Second Division of the American Expeditionary Forces; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. PATMAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 468) to authorize loans, in certain emergency cases, for use in making payments on loans of Federal land banks and joint-stock land banks; to the Committee on Agriculture.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

Memorial from the State Legislature of the State of Idaho, urging the Congress of the United States of America to give careful consideration to and enact such legislation as will permit the United States Government to pay to counties and State the taxes that would ordinarily be assessed against lands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H. R. 16220) for the relief of John A. Rapelye; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BOHN: A bill (H. R. 16221) for the relief of Cadreau Bros.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 16222) for the relief of Mark Parker, alias Harry E. Parks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GIFFORD: A bill (H. R. 16223) for the relief of Charles A. Gettys; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GREENWOOD: A bill (H. R. 16224) granting an increase of pension to Martha Hattery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARE: A bill (H. R. 16225) for the relief of Claud J. Adams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOGG of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 16226) granting an increase of pension to Barbara A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPE: A bill (H. R. 16227) for the relief of M. K. Stephens; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORTON D. HULL: A bill (H. R. 16228) granting a pension to Anna Buckingham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 16229) for the relief of Helena C. VonGroning and Stephan VonGroning; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H. R. 16230) for the relief of George Hamlin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 16231) granting a pension to Florence Bonnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16232) granting a pension to Carrie Boyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 16233) granting an increase of pension to Anna Gault; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 16234) for the relief of the Charles LeRoy estate; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OLIVER of New York: A bill (H. R. 16235) granting an increase of pension to Hattie V. Holdsworth; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 16236) granting a pension to Doris Wehrs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATMAN: A bill (H. R. 16237) for the relief of the heirs of F. P. Brower, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 16238) granting an increase of pension to Rena N. Kerr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 16239) granting an increase of pension to Mary Treadway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STALKER: A bill (H. R. 16240) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca A. Decker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALKER: A bill (H. R. 16241) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITLEY: A bill (H. R. 16242) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth F. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOLVERTON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 16243) granting an increase of pension to Frank C. Nelson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16244) granting an increase of pension to Loverney J. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

8602. By Mr. ANDREW: Petition from various residents of Massachusetts, favoring passage of so-called antivivisection bill, H. R. 7884; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8603. By Mr. BACON: Petition signed by residents of Long Island, urging the enactment by Congress of House bill 7884, providing for exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8604. Also, petition of the East Rockaway Yacht Club, of Long Island, in support of passage of dog antivivisection bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8605. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of residents of the seventh congressional district of California, urging passage of House bill 7884, for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8606. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of residents of New York State, urging the passage of House bill 7884, providing for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8607. By Mr. HILL of Washington: Petition of 35 citizens of Spokane, Wash., urging passage of House bill 7884, for the exemption of dogs from vivisection; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8608. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of 30 citizens of Glenwood, Minn., representing the business men, professionals, and railroad employees, urgently requesting consideration of adequate and proper motor-bus regularity legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8609. Also, petition of members of the Carl A. Hanson Post, No. 321, Elbow Lake, Minn., unanimously favoring leg-

islation to pay off in full adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8610. By Mr. O'CONNOR of New York: Resolution of the Long Island Chamber of Commerce, New York, opposing transfer of all or any part of the New York State canal system to Federal Government under terms and conditions of rivers and harbors act of July 3, 1930; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

8611. By Mr. PRALL: Petition of citizens of the eleventh district, New York, urging the passage of House bill 7884 for the exemption of dogs from vivisection; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8612. By Mr. SHOTT of West Virginia: Memorial of Council of Jewish Women, of Charleston, W. Va., urging legislation permitting admission of wives and children of alien residents; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8613. By Mr. YATES: Petition of Louis J. Cohn, secretary Elliott Varnish Co., 4525 Fifth Avenue, Chicago, Ill., urging the defeat of any legislation tending to increase the rate of first-class postage from 2 cents to 2½ cents per ounce; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

8614. Also, petition of William E. Rasch, 3622 North St. Louis Avenue, Chicago, Ill., president International Brotherhood of Electric Workers, Local No. 134, urging the passage of House bill 10821; to the Committee on Education.

8615. Also, petition of A. B. Miller, 7825 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., urging Congress to pass House bill 10821 for better and more vocational training; to the Committee on Education.